The Middle East . . .

Soviet Statements

January — August 1958

X
32
1
9
o.1422
AIN

Soviet News
Booklet No. 35

4D

CONTENTS

Page

Tass Statement on the Middle East. January 22, 1958 3

N. S. Khrushchov's Speech at Luncheon in Honour of President Nasser, Kremlin, April 30 7

Joint Statement of the Governments of the U.S.S.R. and the United Arab Republic. May 15 11

N. S. Khrushchov's Speech at Soviet-Egyptian Friendship Meeting in the Kremlin. May 15 14

Tass Statement on Lebanon. May 19 20

Against Interference in Lebanese Internal Affairs. Soviet Delegate's Speech in Security Council. June 10 22

Preparations for American and British Armed Intervention in the Lebanon. Tass Statement. June 24 26

Soviet Representative's Statement in the Security Council on the Situation in the Lebanon. July 15 29

Soviet Government's Statement on Events in the Middle East. July 16 32

Soviet Government's Statement on United States and British Aggression in the Middle East. July 18 34

N. S. Khrushchov's Messages to Heads of Government of Great Britain, U.S.A., France and India. July 19 36

N. S. Khrushchov's message to Prime Minister Macmillan. July 23 45

Tass Commentary on Soviet Stand on Summit Meeting. July 30 47

Tass Statement on Meeting of Council of Baghdad Pact. July 30 48

N. S. Khrushchov: Letters to Britain, France and the United States. August 5. 51

Appendix:
Draft of "Basic Principles for a Declaration." February 11, 1957 ... 61

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2018 with funding from
University of Alberta Libraries

https://archive.org/details/middleeastsoviet35unse_0

TASS STATEMENT ON THE MIDDLE EAST

(Published in Pravda *on January 22)*

A REGULAR session of the Council of the Baghdad Pact is being convened in Ankara, the capital of Turkey, on January 27.

Official statements, above all by American statesmen, show that special significance is being attached to this session. It is regarded as a kind of continuation of the session of the Council of the North Atlantic bloc (N.A.T.O.) held in Paris at the end of last year. The powers dominating N.A.T.O. are striving to use the forthcoming session of the Council of the Baghdad bloc in order to draw the Middle East countries that are members of this military grouping into their plans which endanger the cause of peace.

Tass has been authorised to state the following in this connection :

Representatives of the member-countries of the Baghdad Pact—Britain, Iran, Iraq, Turkey and Pakistan—are meeting at a time when the ideas of peaceful co-existence are gaining an increasing hold on the minds of men and women, when the forces standing for peace and international security have become active everywhere, and when ever more determined appeals are being made for East-West talks to establish genuine confidence among states and end the "cold war."

The idea of peaceful co-existence was reflected in a special resolution which was unanimously adopted by the 12th session of the United Nations General Assembly.

Even at the latest session of the N.A.T.O. Council in Paris sober voices were heard opposing the United States' demand for the deployment of nuclear weapons and the establishment of rocket launching sites in the N.A.T.O. member-countries. Some of those who took part in the session of the N.A.T.O. Council openly declared that they refused to meet these United States demands.

The governments of a number of states, including the governments of the member-countries of the Baghdad Pact, have before them the concrete proposals from the Soviet government for easing international tension which were handed to them recently. The Soviet government is known to be proposing that a summit conference be held within the next two or three months to discuss urgent problems, agreement on which would exert a decisive influence on the international situation and would promote an easing of that situation in the Middle East area as well. The slight relaxation of international tension that has recently been perceptible has obviously alarmed certain circles in the United States. The facts show that as soon as the peoples achieve a certain easing of international tension, these circles make fresh attempts to worsen the situation, whatever the cost. It is reported that U.S. State Secretary Dulles is leaving for Ankara to take part in the session of the Council of the Baghdad Pact, although the United States is formally not a member of this grouping. It is not concealed in Washington that Mr. Dulles' journey has the aim of stepping up the activity of the Baghdad military grouping, the actual leadership of which is now being assumed by the United States government. The example of N.A.T.O. shows where this leads. The Paris session of the N.A.T.O. Council has clearly shown that the present line of United States foreign policy is alien to the interests of safeguarding peace and that its true purpose is to continue the "cold war," the unbridled arms race, the inflation of military budgets, the subjugation of

economically weaker states and the exploitation of their natural resources, and, consequently, the further aggravation of the international situation and the provocative propaganda of war and enmity among peoples which is being conducted day in and day out in some countries, and particularly in the United States.

Today very few people doubt that the Baghdad Pact was signed in order to set up a military organisation pursuing aggressive and expansionist aims, among other things, with regard to the Middle East countries which have taken the path of independent development. Not the least of its aims, as seen by the inspirers of the Pact—the United States and Britain, whose Foreign Secretary, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, is also going to the Ankara session—is to divide the countries of the Arab East, to set the countries of this area one against the other. The peoples of the Middle East countries have learned from their own experience the imperialist and colonialist essence of this bloc and have justly called it a "prison of the peoples." Its essence was particularly evident during the British, French and Israeli aggression against Egypt, and also during the preparations for military intervention against Syria, which was prevented by the joint efforts of states which cherish the interests of safeguarding peace. The participation of some of the member-countries of the Baghdad Pact in the aggression against Egypt and in the preparations for a military attack on Syria, has again shown that this pact is fraught with grave danger to the peaceloving states, and particularly to the Middle East countries pursuing a policy of strengthening their national independence.

These facts alone have clearly shown everyone who is not blinded by imperialist propaganda that this bloc is the tool of the colonialists who are interested in restoring their domination in this area. Substantial differences have appeared within the Baghdad Pact under the pressure exerted by the peoples coming out resolutely in support of the just cause of Egypt and Syria, who are defending their national independence. The aggressive actions of some members of this Pact, and also of the United States, which, while trying to remain behind the scenes, actually guided these actions, have not met with the support of other members of the Pact—Iran, Pakistan and Iraq. Credit must be given to the attitude adopted by these countries when the situation over Syria, for instance, was fraught with grave consequences for the cause of peace. The sober evaluation then made of the danger which aggression against Syria would entail, shows that these countries possess forces able to draw a line between the true interests of their peoples and alien interests.

The colonialist designs of the bosses of the Baghdad Pact on the legitimate interests of members of the bloc themselves, are giving rise to understandable alarm even in some Baghdad Pact countries. As a result of all this, this bloc is in a state of paralysis.

Alarmed by this situation, the ruling circles in the United States and Britain are hurriedly taking steps to patch up the cracks developing in this bloc and strengthen it, above all from the military point of view. At the same time the United States, Britain and Turkey are continuing persistently to strive for the expansion of the Baghdad Pact by drawing new members into it, and above all Lebanon and Jordan, and they are continuing to exert every kind of pressure on these Arab states. They do not hide the fact that they are striving to force the member-countries of the Baghdad Pact to take the slippery and precarious path of participating in the preparations for an atomic war.

Just as some European member-countries of N.A.T.O. are now being taken by the throat in order to make them accept American nuclear and rocket weapons, so the Middle East countries are being treated in the same way with the help of the Baghdad Pact. In striving to establish military bases for nuclear and rocket weapons, the United States would obviously like to push back from its own territory the possible theatres of

war and—if the aggressors succeeded in plunging the world into the abyss of war—to expose other countries, including the Baghdad Pact states, to retaliatory blows.

Those who are now striving to attach the Baghdad Pact to the N.A.T.O. war chariot, hypocritically speculate on religious motives, but do not even want to take into account the fact that the building of military bases, the deployment of nuclear weapons and the siting of rocket launching ramps in the Middle East, next to the Moslem holy places, constitute sacrilege against Moslem religious sentiments. It is sufficient to imagine American atomic and hydrogen bomb depots next to the holy places of Mecca and Medina, revered by all the Moslems of the East, and to imagine American bombers flying over these territories with nuclear bombs, to realise how little in common there is between the interests of the Moslem world and the Pentagon's strategic plans. There are many indications that the active participation of the United States in the Ankara session, and Mr. Dulles' visit there, have another purpose—actually to unite under the same signboard the aggressive m i l i t a r y groupings of N.A.T.O., the Baghdad Pact and S.E.A.T.O. It is well known that attempts to unite these blocs legally were made at the recent N.A.T.O. session in Paris. This attempt failed, however, because of the opposition of the West European countries. And now, it appears, an attempt is to be made at the session of the Baghdad Pact to merge these alliances, and here again it is hoped to confront the peoples with a *fait accompli*. But what would this merger mean ? It would mean the conversion of the Baghdad Pact and S.E.A.T.O. into a pliant tool, into an adjunct of the principal aggressive bloc, N.A.T.O., and the automatic extension to members of the Baghdad Pact and S.E.A.T.O. of commitments assumed under the North Atlantic Treaty. Efforts are being made to make the Middle East countries, too, bear the responsibility for the policy of the N.A.T.O. organisers who are pushing their European partners, step by step, towards a precipice. No matter how far from the countries of the area a military conflict may flare up—whether in Central Europe or the Pacific—the countries belonging to the Baghdad Pact would find themselves directly threatened, for the flames of missile and atomic war would spread to their territories by virtue of the military commitments binding the members of these three military blocs.

Those behind this dangerous venture are not greatly worried by the fact that such a merger of the three aggressive military blocs and the co-ordination of their military efforts have nothing in common with the aims and principles of the United Nations, and are indeed a mockery of them. They have only one concern—to cover the territories of the Middle East countries, as soon as possible, with a network of American airfields, rocket launching installations and dumps of atom and hydrogen bombs, and to secure more cannon fodder. It is sufficient to imagine what the recent military operations against Egypt would have developed into if atomic and rocket weapons had been stationed in Baghdad Pact countries, in order to understand the extent of the mortal danger that would arise for the countries of the Middle East if these plans were to be carried out.

There is no need to say that these and other measures planned for the militarisation of Baghdad bloc countries would involve more and more material sacrifices, an increase in the burden of taxation and a further strain on their national economies, and would thereby entail the further lowering of their living standards. This would benefit no one except the big American monopolies which are seeking to prevent the economic advancement of the countries of the East, the development of their national industry and agriculture, the strengthening of their economic independence. It is only natural that this policy of the organisers of the Baghdad Pact is opposed by the general public and even by some persons in official positions in

the Baghdad Pact countries, and it cannot be otherwise.

Mention should be made of the position of Turkey. It would seem that it is in her national interests, as also in the interests of the other countries of the area, to strengthen peace and to pursue a policy of friendly co-operation with her neighbours. The Turkish government, however, as distinct from the governments of some other N.A.T.O. countries, has shown, by taking an especially aggressive stand at the December session of the N.A.T.O. Council and by calling for the further intensification of the arms race and for the immediate supplying of Turkey with nuclear and rocket weapons, that it intends to proceed with a policy which is far from representing a sober appreciation of the dangerous consequences implied in this, in the first place for Turkey herself.

It is obvious that the stationing of nuclear weapons and rocket installations on the territory of Turkey would be a great danger to the peoples of the Middle East, and not only to them. If the United States, lying as it does thousands of kilometres from the area, chooses to ignore this, hoping to push Turkey and other members of the Baghdad Pact on to a dangerous road, this merely demonstrates once again its utter indifference to the fate of the peoples of the area.

However, the U.S. Secretary of State is going to the Middle East, not only in his official capacity but also, according to the foreign press, as a representative of the oil monopolies and, in the first instance, the Rockefeller oil empire. American oil magnates are obviously alarmed by the movement that is developing in the Middle East for a revision of the terms of the enslaving agreements forced on the countries of the area by American monopolies. It appears that Mr. Dulles has been entrusted with the task of defending every cent of the fabulous profits which United States monopolies are coining by exploiting the oil wealth of the Middle East.

With the Ankara session about to begin, Washington is boosting plans for so-called economic aid to countries connected with the Baghdad Pact. The nature of such honeyed promises is obvious. It is no secret that even Turkey who, nobody knows why, is particularly active in the Baghdad grouping, has not been able, for a number of years, to obtain American aid for the development of her national industry. The whole of United States "aid" to Turkey is aimed at the militarisation of that country. Are the other Baghdad Pact countries in a better position? By no means.

Not even the most rabid propagandist of American "aid" can name a single country in the Middle East where this "aid" has resulted in the construction of new enterprises required by their national economy, new orchards, or water for the sun-parched land. It is common knowledge that the miserable handouts that American propagandists are speculating on constitute only an insignificant part of the huge profits that the colonialists receive by exploiting the population and the natural wealth of the area. Yet, strange as it may seem, there are still governments which are readily tempted by these handouts and thus jeopardise the national independence and sovereignty of their countries.

As experience shows, it is not concern for the economic development of the area but, in the first instance, the desire of aggressive foreign circles to strengthen their economic and military-strategic positions in the Middle East that lies behind the great interest they display in the countries of that area. To put it in a nutshell, they want to pay in cheques and banknotes for sites for atomic and missile bases and thus create conditions which would enable the creditor country to become the arbiter of the life or death of the population of countries which receive this "aid."

However, the situation in the Middle East has changed radically and is now different from that which existed there only recently. A number of new independent states have emerged in the area by freeing themselves from colonial

oppression, and no colonial blocs or doctrines can arrest their onward movement.

The ideas of peace and international co-operation which are advocated and fought for by the Soviet Union and other peaceable states are approved and supported by the peoples in both the West and the East. This policy was supported by the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference, held recently in Cairo, which demonstrated the constantly growing unity of the peoples of the East in the struggle against colonialism. The Cairo Conference condemned the imperialist policy of building up and extending military groupings that is being pursued by the western powers in the Middle East. It rightly emphasised that both the Baghdad Pact and the Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine were in contradiction with the independence of the Arab countries, infringed upon their sovereignty and menaced their security.

The Middle East can and should become a zone of peace, free from nuclear and rocket weapons, a zone of good neighbourliness and friendly co-operation between states. The organisers of the Baghdad Pact are seeking to prevent this by utilising, on this occasion, the session of the Council of the Baghdad Pact in Ankara.

In connection with what has been said above, official circles in the Soviet Union consider it necessary to draw the attention of the governments of Baghdad Pact countries to the fact that the entire responsibility for this policy and its consequences rests with the government of the United States and the ruling circles of those countries belonging to this bloc which follow in the wake of the policy of foreign imperialist circles.

N. S. Khrushchov's Speech at Luncheon in Honour of President Nasser

Kremlin, April 30

MR. President, Gentlemen, Dear Friends, allow me to express our friendly feelings, to you, Mr. President, and the statesmen of the United Arab Republic who are accompanying you on your good will and friendship visit to the Soviet Union. We are very glad that you have come to the Soviet Union. We are also happy that your visit to the Soviet Union has coincided with the May Day celebrations.

The talks we have had with you during our meetings have demonstrated a friendly atmosphere and mutual understanding in assessing current international problems, and especially in assessing the problems of the struggle for peace, for the further development and strengthening of the friendship between our countries.

Mr. President, you participated in the Bandung Conference and took part in drafting its decisions. If all states had been guided by the principles underlying the decisions of the Bandung Conference, the peace of the world would have been ensured. The Soviet Union welcomed the Bandung Conference decisions ; it also supports the decisions of the Conference of Afro-Asian Countries recently held in Cairo.

Our disinterested foreign policy—a policy based on principle—should be clear to you. It is not a comtemplative, but an active policy of struggle against evil forces—the aggressive, monopolistic and colonialist forces which have not renounced their hopes of perpetuating colonial slavery, of continuing to plunder and exploit the peoples of Asia and Africa.

We want universal peace. We desire friendship with all nations ; we want disarmament ; we want an end to the

policy of the " cold war."

You know that the Soviet Union has unilaterally ended nuclear tests—an act prompted by our country's sincere desire to make a beginning for clearing the international atmosphere, for a genuine solution to the disarmament problem.

Unfortunately the western powers possessing nuclear weapons refuse to follow our example, and now there has come the news that Britain has exploded a hydrogen bomb. But by doing this, Britain has exploded not only a hydrogen bomb—the main point is that she has exploded the trust and hopes of millions of people who expected that the ruling circles of Britain and the United States would display sound judgment, follow the example of the Soviet Union, and thus create the prerequisites for ending the " cold war " and ensuring world peace.

The western powers are blasting the hopes of people who expected that during the conference of heads of government means would be found to settle outstanding issues peacefully, without war.

People in all countries will correctly appreciate the noble act of the Soviet government in unilaterally ending nuclear tests and will condemn the reckless act of the ruling circles of Britain who sanctioned the explosion of the hydrogen bomb. And it will be specially noted that it was Britain who assumed this unseemly role. By exploding the bomb she has signalled that the United States, too, will follow her example.

The whole world will draw the appropriate conclusions from this circumstance. The Soviet Union is not to be intimidated by such explosions. Our policy remains unchanged and we shall work to reduce international tension, to end the " cold war " and solve the disarmament problem. But we must be on our guard and not relax our efforts for the strengthening of our state, so that the Soviet Union may not be caught unawares by aggressors and may be able to give fitting rebuff to aggressors if they try to cross the line between a " cold war " and a " hot war."

The President of the United States, in his speeches, has made many declarations to the effect that in his activities he has been guided solely by the interests of safeguarding peace, that the United States has been pursuing only peaceful aims.

Such declarations scarcely tally with its deeds. The deeds of the ruling circles of the United States contradict these statements. The explosion of a nuclear weapon by the British has unquestionably been co-ordinated with the United States. The latter is also preparing tests and will evidently carry out explosions of nuclear weapons. The peoples judge the policy of political leaders, not by what they say, but by what they do. The deeds and actions of the statesmen of the United States and Britain show up the activities of the American and British governments in a very unseemly light.

We have already drawn the attention of all countries to the provocative flights by American aircraft, loaded with hydrogen weapons, towards the Soviet frontiers. It is clear to everyone that such provocative and dangerous actions in no way tally with the peaceable statements of the United States government.

The nuclear explosion carried out by Britain is calculated to foment the " cold war," to intimidate the faint-hearted. But gone are the times when the British lion roared and everything trembled. Now it can frighten no one. We should not like to recall the failure of the adventurist policy of Britain who, together with France and Israel, committed aggression against Egypt in 1956. But they compel us to recall this, because the British authorities have carried out the explosion in order to bring pressure to bear on us. We must tell these gentlemen, however, that they are in for a disillusionment. It does not produce upon us the impression they expected.

The leading statesmen of the United States and Britain say that they must continue explosions of nuclear weapons because the Soviet Union recently carried out a series of nuclear tests and only then announced the ending of tests. Yet is is a fact that the United States has

carried out considerably more explosions of nuclear weapons than the Soviet Union. To judge by the number of explosions, we, having ended tests, remain at a disadvantage. Nevertheless we resolved on that course and urged the countries possessing nuclear weapons to follow our example. We were ready to perpetuate this disadvantageous position of ours. That did not worry us. We believed that our decision would be the initial step towards reaching agreement on disarmament in order to exclude war as a means of solving disputed questions.

Now the Americans, as the American press puts it, are preparing a show. But this is a disgraceful show. They intend to carry out explosions of nuclear weapons and to invite to these tests representatives of other states so that they may see how the American monopolists are developing weapons for the mass annihilation of human beings.

The Soviet government has not yet determined its official attitude with regard to this spectacle. But I think it will hardly agree to send its representatives there, since that would constitute a kind of moral support for the champions of fomenting the "cold war" and support for their allegation that it is possible to develop a "clean" bomb, which would be, so to speak, a "noble" weapon for the vile deed of annihilating human beings.

And people who are preparing this lethal weapon call themselves Christians, go to church and pray to God. They call us atheists and describe us as people with whom it is impossible to reach agreement and whose word cannot be trusted. Yet, nevertheless, these atheists have been the first to set the example of a noble deed and to end unilaterally the tests of the most deadly weapon—the nuclear weapon.

The peaceloving foreign policy of the Soviet Union is clear and understandable to the peoples. The peoples see that the Soviet government is resolutely and consistently pursuing a policy of peaceful co-existence. At the same time, the peoples see that the ruling circles of the imperialist powers, who stubbornly cling to the "cold war" and a continued arms race, do not want to ease international tension and establish greater confidence between states.

We sincerely rejoice that relations between the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic are not in the least clouded. We only desire one thing: the strengthening of the positions gained by the Arab peoples, and above all the United Arab Republic. In this you are backed not only by the Soviet Union, but by all progressive mankind. The peoples of the socialist countries applauded when you strove, and they applaud when you strive now so selflessly for your independence, for the strengthening of your national economy, for the raising of your people's living standards. Grossly distorting our peaceloving policy, the imperialist circles raise a rumpus about the Soviet Union's "special" interest in this area. We indignantly reject these utterly false assertions. In our disinterested aid to the Middle East countries we have never pursued any selfish aims. The concepts and methods of the colonialists, who believe that if they do not oppress this or that nation, others must do so, are alien to the Soviet socialist state. We communists maintain that no one may impose his will on the peoples. The peoples themselves are the masters of their land, and only they can and must establish the way of life they prefer to have in their countries.

The imperialists, who have the habit of oppressing the peoples they have subjugated, in their day established the disgraceful system of colonialism. They are so used to it that they regard the system of colonial oppression as a just and lawful system.

We saw this particularly clearly in April, 1956, when we visited Britain with N. A. Bulganin and had talks with Anthony Eden, Selwyn Lloyd and other statesmen. In one of our talks Sir Anthony Eden bluntly said that if the Arab nations did not supply oil to Britain, she would be ready to go to war.

"We beg your pardon," we said then to the British statesmen, "but the sources

of oil belong to the Middle East peoples, and we presume that no one has the right to deprive those countries of the wealth that belongs to them." It would be much more reasonable, we advised, not to try and seize this wealth by force, but to conduct mutually beneficial trade with those to whom those sources of oil belonged. The Arab states would, of course, not sell their oil to those who did not offer a suitable price for it. The policy of colonial oppression and plunder was now unthinkable; it was doomed to failure.

The British statesmen then told us that the correlation of forces in that area was not in the Arabs' favour and that Israel could defeat the Arab states. We retorted by saying that those who thought so were cherishing a futile hope. The population of Israel amounted to approximately one and a half million, whereas the population of the Arab states was over 70 million. We said that if Israel were to unleash a war against the Arabs, we believed that the Arabs would start a holy war against the invaders. And that war would inevitably end in the defeat of the aggressors. All progressive mankind would back the Arab countries. Moral support for the Arab states might entail material support in that case, and also the participation of volunteers in the Arab struggle against the invaders.

We advised the British statesmen not to start a war against the Arabs, but they did not heed our counsels and launched aggression against Egypt which ended in a disgraceful failure.

We should like the colonialists to draw a correct conclusion from this and to refrain from using arms to annex foreign territory and to subjugate other peoples to their policy. We want peace throughout the world. The Middle East is one of the most inflammable spots, after Western Europe, where large forces are facing each other.

The Soviet government has proposed that a summit conference be held in order jointly to find ways for solving urgent international problems. But the summit meetings and talks must be conducted with due regard for the interests of all countries, on the only acceptable principles of non-interference in the affairs of other states. We must reach mutual agreement, not at the expense of any other countries.

Highly developed powers must render aid to backward states without attaching any political, military or economic strings to it. We must develop mutually beneficial trade so that the Arabs, for instance, who are rich in oil and cotton, can sell their products at a suitable price to any country.

The foreign policy of the Soviet Union and all the socialist countries is being recognised by an ever-increasing number of states as a policy of peace and unselfishness. We aid—to the extent permitted by our material resources—the countries which still have an underdeveloped economy. We render assistance to other states and shall continue to do so. Our future aid will obviously grow along with the expansion of our economy.

My speech has proved to be rather long, but I wanted to elucidate once again certain questions so that we may be better understood.

I drink to the health of our dear guest —the President of the United Arab Republic, Gamal Abdel Nasser, to the national hero who boldly raised the banner of struggle against the colonialists, who waged and is waging a struggle for the independence of his republic and the other Arab states which have still not thrown off the colonialist yoke!

Our sympathy, dear friends, is on your side, on the side of the peoples waging a struggle for their freedom and independence.

I believe that you have the sympathy, not only of the Soviet people, but of the peoples of all the socialist countries as well! This means already some 1,000 million people. In the capitalist countries the progressive-minded people also sympathise with your noble and just struggle. To your health! To your success!

Joint Statement of the Governments of the USSR and the United Arab Republic

May 15, 1958

GAMAL ABDEL NASSER, President of the United Arab Republic, has made an official visit to the Soviet Union, at the invitation of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Soviet government.

During his stay in the U.S.S.R. friendly talks were held between leaders of both governments which took place in an atmosphere of mutual confidence and friendship. These discussions touched upon questions of common interest to the two countries and on a number of international problems and events which are now in the centre of world public attention.

The Soviet Union was represented in these discussions by K. E. Voroshilov, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. ; N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. ; A. I. Mikoyan, First Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. ; F. R. Kozlov, First Vice-Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R. ; A. I. Kirichenko, member of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R. ; N. A. Mukhitdinov, chairman of the Foreign Affiairs Commission of the Soviet of Nationalities of the U.S.S.R. Supreme Soviet ; and A. A. Gromyko, Minister of Foreign Affairs of the U.S.S.R.

The United Arab Republic was represented in the discussions by President Gamal Abdel Nasser ; Vice-President Abdel Latif Mahmud el Bogdadi ; Vice-President Akram el Haurani; Minister of Education Kamaleddin Hussein ; Minister of Foreign Affairs Dr. Mahmud Fawzi ; Minister of State for Presidential Affairs Ali Sabri ; Minister of Rural and Municipal Affairs for the Syrian region of the United Arab Republic Ahmed Abdel Karim ; director of the General Information Service, Minister Salah Mohammed Nasr ; and Ambassador of the United Arab Republic to the U.S.S.R. Mohammed A. el Kouni.

As a result of the talks both governments drew the following conclusions :

The two governments express their profound satisfaction with the development of the close and steadily expanding relations between the two countries ; they will strive for the further development and consolidation of these relations, guided by the following principles :

Mutual respect for the sovereignty and territorial integrity of all states ;

Non-intervention in any way in the domestic affairs of any state ;

Solution of international problems exclusively by peaceful means and renunciation of the use of force against the sovereignty and independence of any state ;

Rejection of the use of political or economic pressure ;

Equality in relations between states and between nations.

Both governments adhere to the principle of peaceful co-existence among states irrespective of their social systems, considering that this principle is the cornerstone for the development of friendly relations between states and accords with the interests of world peace. They believe that an end to the "cold war" accords with the vital interests of all peoples, will promote friendly and good-neighbourly relations between them and strengthen mutual confidence between states.

They denounce colonialism in all its manifestations and aspects and support the right of the peoples to self-determination and independence. The two governments denounce the existence of military bases of some countries on the territories of others. Such bases constitute a serious threat to world peace and infringe the independence of those states

on whose territories they are situated ; these bases must be abolished.

The two governments examined the question of the rights of the Palestinian Arabs and of their expulsion from their homes. They also examined the question of the violation of human rights and the threat to peace and security in that area which this entails. Both governments reaffirm their full support for the legitimate rights of the Palestinian Arabs.

Both governments denounce the colonial aggression against the Yemen and the attempts to intervene in the internal affairs of the Yemen. Both governments fully support the independence, sovereignty and territorial integrity of the Yemen.

Both governments deplore the savage war France is waging against the Algerian people and the crimes the French armed forces are committing against this heroic Arab country. They call the attention of the world public opinion to the actions of the French authorities, which have forcibly expelled hundreds of thousands of Algerians from the Algerian-Tunisian border area, actions which, in violation of human rights, have left people homeless, women and children among them, and have led to the destruction of whole villages. Both governments fully support the right of the Algerian people to self-determination and independence. They insistently call for a settlement of the Algerian issue on this basis by peaceful means and they are confident that this will promote the interests of the two sides.

Both governments express their deep anxiety at the acts of interference by certain foreign states in the internal affairs of Indonesia. They regard this interference as a threat to world peace and security and as a breach of the United Nations Charter ; they declare that this has to be stopped and that the independence and sovereignty of Indonesia must be respected.

Both governments believe in the importance of the United Nations and its role in the maintenance of peace and security and in the peaceful settlement of international problems. They consider that efforts should be made to strengthen this organisation by every means, to make it more effective in carrying out its tasks. Both governments equally believe that the Chinese People's Republic must be given its seat in the United Nations, in order to rectify the present abnormal situation and to further international co-operation and decrease tension in the Far East and all over the world.

Both governments reaffirm their support for the principles enunciated at Bandung, which continue to unite the peoples of Asia and Africa and are attracting increasing world public attention, and which have been reasserted by the Afro-Asian Solidarity Conference which met in Cairo in 1957 and expressed the hopes and aspirations of these two continents. Both governments likewise declare their support for the principles enunciated at the Conference of Independent African States in Accra in April 1958.

Both governments express their deep anxiety at the arms race, which is one of the greatest perils threatening world peace and which may lead to a devastating nuclear war. Both governments hereby declare that the testing of atomic and hydrogen weapons must be ended by all states possessing such weapons, pending the necessary agreement or agreements on the final and unconditional prohibition of all types of nuclear weapons, up to and including the ending of the manufacture of these weapons, the withdrawal of nuclear weapons from national armaments and the destruction of the stocks of such weapons.

Both governments declare that atomic and hydrogen energy must be used for peaceful purposes only and that all countries should co-operate in this field in order to improve the living standards of the peoples, particularly those of the underdeveloped countries.

Both governments consider that the states must redouble their efforts towards the eventual conclusion of an agreement on a substantial reduction of national armed forces and armaments.

Both governments are of the opinion that the conclusion of non-aggression pacts between the states is one of the ways to reduce international tension,

considering that the conclusion of such pacts would be consistent with the peaceful objectives and principles of the United Nations.

It is the firm conviction of both governments that the furtherance of economic and cultural relations between the states must be encouraged as a way to the establishment of mutual understanding between the peoples for the sake of reducing tension and as a way to preserve peace. Such relations should not be accompanied by any conditions or motives designed to allow one state to dominate another.

Both governments declare that the economic and cultural agreement concluded between the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic are consistent with these requirements and are based on sound principles. They likewise express their complete satisfaction with the development of economic and cultural co-operation between their respective countries and with commercial exchanges between them. In this connection the government of the United Arab Republic has expressed gratitude for the Soviet Union's sizable contribution to the United Arab Republic"s industrialisation programme. Both governments reaffirm their determination to seek a further expansion of economic and cultural co-operation between the two countries to their common good.

Both governments consider that the artificial barriers to world trade must be removed.

Both governments express their complete satisfaction with the results of the present discussions. They regard the meeting of the leaders of the two states as a useful opportunity for an exchange of opinion to the common good of their peoples, and also as an important factor for the consolidation of their economic, cultural and social relations, contributing to universal peace.

Both governments regard as important meetings and contacts between government leaders, in the belief that mutual understanding and mutual trust will thus be strengthened and the chances of settling differences increased.

Both governments consider that the summoning of a summit conference with the participation of the great powers as well as certain other states would be of paramount importance and must be expedited.

Both governments are deeply satisfied to note the close and developing co-operation between the two countries in every field of activity, which is to their common advantage and promotes universal peace and progress.

President Gamal Abdel Nasser of the United Arab Republic has invited K. E. Voroshilov, President of the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the U.S.S.R., N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the U.S.S.R., and other leaders of the Soviet Union to visit the United Arab Republic. The invitation has been gratefully accepted.

N. KHRUSHCHOV
Chairman of the Council of Ministers
of the Union of Soviet
Socialist Republics

GAMAL ABDEL NASSER
President of the United Arab Republic

Moscow. May 15, 1958.

N. S. KHRUSHCHOV'S SPEECH AT SOVIET-EGYPTIAN FRIENDSHIP MEETING IN KREMLIN

May 15, 1958

ESTEEMED Mr. President Gamal Abdel Nasser, Our Esteemed Guests Accompanying the President of the United Arab Republic, Dear Comrades, we have gathered here today to express the feelings of friendship of the peoples of the Soviet Union for the peoples of the United Arab Republic. Allow me once again, from the bottom of my heart, to greet Mr. Nasser, the President of the United Arab Republic, and all our welcome guests accompanying the President.

It gives us joy to say that the relations between our countries and our peoples are improving with every year and developing in a spirit of sincere friendship and co-operation.

The Soviet Union is an irreconcilable opponent of the shameful system of colonialism and gives support to all peoples who are fighting for their national liberation, for the strengthening of their national independence. We know with what difficulty the new is born. The old forces not only do not want to recognise the new, but do everything possible to nip it in the bud.

The Soviet state was born and grew stronger fighting against the forces of the old world. The United Arab Republic, uniting two independent Arab states, Egypt and Syria, countries with an ancient culture, was born and is growing stronger in struggle against the forces of imperialism.

The Great October Socialist Revolution struck a powerful blow at the entire system of imperialism and colonialism. The past 40 years have seen tremendous changes throughout the world. The defeat of the aggressors in the Second World War, the victory of the People's Liberation Revolution in China, the formation of a whole group of socialist states in Europe and Asia—all this dealt another crushing blow at imperialism. One colonial empire after another began to tumble down, and more and more independent states are emerging in the world.

When a government headed by President Nasser took office in Egypt and began to carry through a policy in the interests of its country, the colonialists tried to block the road and to impede the work of the Egyptian government. They staged conspiracies, hired assassins, and tried to overthrow the government. The imperialists did everything possible to prevent the consolidation of the Egyptian state. When the plots failed, they decided to restore the colonial régime by force and launched a predatory war against Egypt. The war gamble imposed upon Egypt ended in a disgraceful failure for the colonial powers and a remarkable victory for the Egyptian people. We admire the heroic struggle of the Arab people for their freedom and independence and the courage they displayed when repelling British, French and Israeli intervention against Egypt.

The Soviet people rejoice at the liberation of peoples of Asia and Africa from the yoke of colonialism. We, for our part, are ready to do everything in our power to facilitate the complete liberation of the colonial and dependent countries.

The United Arab Republic follows the road of safeguarding the interests of its state against the intrigues of the colonialists, the road of strengthening co-operation with the peaceloving states.

The friendly relations between our countries took shape on the basis of the recognition and application of the principles of mutual respect for terri-

torial integrity and sovereignty, non-aggression, non-interference in one another's internal affairs, equality and mutual benefit, peaceful co-existence and economic co-operation. These great principles now underlying the relations between many countries fully accord with the peaceful foreign policy of the Soviet Union which we have been carrying out since the first years of Soviet power. The principles of peaceful co-existence proclaimed by Lenin, the peaceable foreign policy of the Soviet state follow from the very essence of our social system.

One of the chief factors making for *rapprochements* between states are mutually beneficial economic relations. Sometimes an incorrect atttitude on the part of one side towards the economic interests of the other side can lead to serious disappointment. Sometimes it even happens between friends that an incorrect attitude on the part of one country towards the economic interests of another can lead to unpleasant relations between them.

Nothing like this can be expected in relations between our two countries. And we are sincerely glad of it.

Indeed, there are different notions about friendship. Imperialists like to talk of their "friendship" with the colonial peoples. But what they want in this friendship is that the "friend" —whom they call "friend" in such a kindly way—should in fact be their slave, that he should work in a sheep-like way for his "friend," the colonialist, and that the latter should enjoy all the fruits of his work.

It is this sort of "friendship" which the imperialist powers want. What they do change once in a while is only the forms of that friendship. They seek to perpetuate its essence—the exploitation of one nation by another. The colonialists often try to produce the impression that the enslaved peoples are all but dreaming of such "friendship." Their reasoning is roughly as follows: "Yes, these countries were conquered once. But why were they conquered? It was not as simple as that; they were educated people who came there and brought civilisation with them."

But since the natives of those countries—Moslems or Hindus, for instance —wanted to live in accordance with the laws and creeds of their forefathers, the colonialists exterminated considerable numbers of them. "Civilisation" triumphed in the end, and the colonialists implanted a régime of their own in the countries they conquered.

The piratical enslavement of peoples has been and is still carried out under cover of hypocritical claims about the noble mission of the colonialists.

As a result of this practice of installing "civilisation," many nations which were once the wellsprings of the progress of human culture, came, during the years of foreign domination, to lag far behind the countries which were lording it in the subject countries. Today, too, the colonialists maintain that they cannot withdraw from those countries as those peoples have not yet reached the stage in their development which can make them capable of self-government.

How preposterously false such assertions are! Is there, indeed, any need for Dutch, British, French, or any other colonialists for that matter, to teach statesmanship or principles of social structure to the peoples of Indonesia, India, Egypt, Burma or any other similar countries where culture developed much earlier than it did in the so-called civilised countries?

We are most determined opponents of such "civilisation," opponents of the shameful system of colonialism.

We realise that the countries of western Europe are interested in the raw materials which they are getting from countries of the East. But this does not in the least mean that the imperialists may impose by force their fettering conditions for the exploitation of the wealth of those countries. Supplies of raw materials for western nations must be ensured, not through robbing the countries of the East, but by developing mutually beneficial trading relations so that those countries may be properly compensated by the western nations for the raw material and goods which they supply to them. Far from obstructing such relations, we do everything to encourage them, because we

ourselves abide by the principle of developing mutually advantageous relations with all countries.

But we can never, of course, remain indifferent if imperialist circles try to impose their will by force on the nations which have cast off the chains of colonial enslavement, if imperialists persist in their bankrupt policy of colonialism. That is contrary to our understanding of normal international relations. We shall always side with those who are fighting for the freedom and independence of their countries.

While establishing friendly relations with other countries, we have never forced on them, nor do we want to force on them, our system of government, nor do we aim to derive privileges or any special material benefits.

What are the Arab countries rich in? They are an exceedingly rich area of the world, possessing vast natural resources and great potentialities for the development of their economies and culture and for improving the wellbeing of their people. Oil figures largely in the external economic and trading relations of the Arab countries. But nature has not been unkind to our country in this respect. We also have unlimited oil reserves.

The Arab countries are blessed with plenty of sunshine and favourable climatic conditions enable them to grow cotton—"white gold." We, too, have unlimited possibilities for growing cotton and we do grow it in large quantities in our fields.

What else do the Arab countries have? They grow bananas and dates, for instance. We have none of these. So, shall we go to war about it? To please our eaters of bananas and dates we can buy them, by agreement, from the United Arab Republic or any other countries in such a way that they can sell them to us at an acceptable price and buy in our country the goods which they have not got. This applies to other things as well: What we do not possess for some reason or other, we can get through a mutually beneficial exchange of goods, that is to say, by trading, and not by extortion or blackmail.

Our people are used to earning their own living; we respect the labour of all peoples and believe that every man and woman and all peoples have the right to dispose of the fruits of their work and of the riches of their countries.

This is why there are no such issues in our relations with the United Arab Republic, or with any other country, that could set us at loggerheads. If every country and every government refrained form creating any artificial excuses for conflict, then normal relations between the nations would be developing on a sound and firm basis.

The Soviet Union concluded agreements with Egypt and Syria, which have since formed a united Arab state. We shall constantly abide by the conditions of these treaties, which will, we hope, promote the development of the United Arab Republic and its economic advancement.

It is well known that political independence alone is not enough. A country's political independence is strong when the country has a firm economic basis. People who are unable to defend their independence can lose it, either as a result of direct enemy attack or internal subversion through a puppet government.

The imperialists have great "experience" in this matter. They know how to create in dependent countries governments which are national only in form but which, in essence, help to strengthen the domination of colonialism. With the help of such governments, bought by the colonialists, the imperialists are still virtual masters of the economy of a whole series of states which, from the formal standpoint, seem to be independent.

We rejoice at the fact that the United Arab Republic, notwithstanding the intrigues of imperialist robbers, is conducting an independent policy, firmly striving for the development of its economy and the utmost strengthening of its national independence, and waging a struggle for peace and the security of the peoples.

Today the peoples have no greater concern than to prevent war. The

peoples judge the policies of governments according to what they do to improve the international situation, to create normal relations among all states, to eliminate the "cold war" and to maintain peace.

We stand for the elimination of the "cold war." This attitude of ours is well known to all honest people. The Soviet Union has unilaterally suspended nuclear weapon tests. Unfortunately, notwithstanding our persistent appeals and the demand of the peoples that the United States and Britain follow suit, those countries, far from following suit, have demonstratively begun to stage further nuclear weapon tests.

However, we do not give up the hope that sound reason will ultimately prevail in world politics.

The Soviet Union stands for an end to the "cold war" and for peaceful coexistence and competition between the two social systems. We boldly look ahead and firmly believe in the socialist system, in the superiority of its planned development that knows no crises.

The economy, science and technology of our country are steadily advancing. Recently the whole world saluted the launching of two Soviet artificial earth satellites and today a third Soviet sputnik has been launched into space and has entered its orbit. The weight of this sputnik is 1,327 kilograms,[1] including scientific equipment weighing 968 kilograms.[2]

Rejoicing in these achievements of Soviet science and engineering, we do not want in any way to humiliate the United States, and still less to insult it, or to belittle its achievements. Yet we cannot deny ourselves the pleasure of expressing our pride in our country's success.

If we take the weight of our third sputnik and, as is done in arithmetic, divide it by the weight of an American earth satellite, one would need a very large basket to accommodate a sufficient number of orange-sized American artificial satellites to equal the weight of the third Soviet sputnik. I should very much like to be correctly understood in the United States. We do not in any way doubt the United States' achievements in industry, science and technology, but permit us not to deny ourselves our national pride and joy over our science and technology, over our industry, over our socialist system, which has ensured us outstanding success and enabled us to outstrip the technology and science of the United States in this respect.

We have said more than once, and we say again, that in no case do we want to use our achievements to harm mankind—neither simply openly nor covertly either—by means of threats and blackmail. We only want to emphasise that attempts by certain circles to surround us by some artificial barrier, to isolate us from other countries, and the effort to belittle the development of our economy, to impede the advance of science and engineering in the Soviet Union, which certain United States circles have been trying to do for several years, will fail to achieve their objects.

On the contrary — they want to isolate us, but in fact, instead of isolating us, they are isolating themselves from our successes. For it has become universally known that Soviet science and technology have, in a number of fields, surpassed the development of American science and technology. Isn't it time for a more realistic approach to things—not to frighten each other, but rather to sit down at one table and talk matters over, about how to go on living, how to improve contacts and extend economic and cultural relations between our countries? The peoples expect this, not only the peoples of the Soviet Union but also the peoples of the United States, the peoples of the world.

The new and outstanding achievement of Soviet scientists, engineers, technicians and workers who have designed, manufactured and launched such a big artificial satellite into space, shows that scientific and technical thought in the Soviet Union is developing at an exceptionally rapid rate, and that

[1] Nearly 1 ton 6 cwt.
[2] More than 19 cwt.

Soviet industry is able to accomplish any task of modern development.

Permit me, from the bottom of my heart, to congratulate our scientists, engineers and workers who have taken part in designing the new artificial earth satellite, to congratulate them on their outstanding victory.

Everyone knows that there is no need to search for a solution to international problems through aggression and war. Without war, we shall carry out sooner all the plans for our peaceful construction.

We are sincerely striving for a relaxation of international tension. That is why we are surprised at the fact that the fully substantiated protest by the Soviet government against the flights by American planes carrying hydrogen bombs towards the frontiers of the Soviet Union has not as yet enlisted support in the Security Council, for it is precisely that body that bears direct responsibility for preventing war, for promoting the maintenance of peace.

Instead of denouncing those responsible for such flights which are dangerous to peace, the United States representatives tried to replace one question by another. Thus, instead of denouncing those who are taking aggressive steps and may provoke a war, we are asked to recognise the right to such flights, but only on a smaller scale. The United States government submitted a proposal to the United Nations for establishing inspection in the Arctic and promised to reduce the number of flights of its planes towards the frontiers of the Soviet Union. To reduce, mind you, and not to discontinue. But how can one accept such proposals?

By following in the wake of the sponsors of these dangerous manoeuvres, the Security Council is undermining its own prestige. Such actions are not accidental. The Security Council consists almost entirely of representatives of those countries that are either dependent on the United States or are tied to it through military blocs. Who can take seriously claims that, for instance, the representative of the wretched Chiang Kai-shek clique, planted in the Security Council, can act objectively and facilitate the maintenance of peace? He represents no one and lives by sponging on the United States. And can certain other representatives of the N.A.T.O. states voice opinions different from those desired by the United States? Of course not, because they are tied hand and foot by various obligations to the United States.

It is high time to understand that arithmetic cannot always be applied in politics.

Sometimes we are blamed for frequently resorting to the veto in the Security Council. We do not exercise this right very often. but we do exercise it. We did not sponsor the inclusion of this rule in the United Nations Charter, but we believe it to be a good rule. It makes it possible to avoid unjust decisions and compels a search to be made by joint efforts for correct solutions of disputed problems—solutions such as will take into account the interests of all the powers concerned, the interests of maintaining peace. The right of veto protects the United Nations from the adoption of tendentious decisions that are sometimes even dangerous to the cause of peace. And we shall exercise this right in order to protect the world from unjust decisions.

At the present time all peoples place great hopes in a summit conference. Why do we believe such a meeting might be useful? Because, in our opinion, certain international problems are already ripe for a solution. Agreement on urgent questions at a meeting of the heads of government would mark the beginning of an improvement in the international atmosphere, would be an advance towards eliminating the "cold war." If we do settle some questions, we shall create a sound foundation for the solution of more complicated problems as well.

A summit meeting is a serious matter and all the possible participants must take it seriously. For our part, we have done and are doing everything possible to bring about an early meeting and to make it a success.

Some western representatives are putting forward obviously unacceptable

conditions and items which a summit conference must allegedly take up. Can such a conference really be made a success if it discusses the state system in East European countries and examines the German question in the way suggested by the western powers, ignoring the existence of the two German states? Even to raise these questions is illogical, as we have said more than once. The German question can be looked into at the summit only insofar as the conclusion of a peace treaty is concerned. The reunification of Germany is the domestic affair of the German people.

Such questions can only be raised if one wants to obstruct the calling of a summit conference, to wreck the improvement that is emerging in the international situation.

One of the most vital international problems awaiting solution is the question of disarmament. We have already said that the Soviet Union is willing to settle it, and to settle it immediately. But it must be settled with due regard for the interests of the security of all parties concerned.

The experience of our relations with the western countries has shown that they do not want to accept a major solution of the disarmament problem. However, a gradual approach is possible. Why not reach agreement, for instance, on the ending of nuclear weapon tests, the reduction of armed forces, and then try to solve other problems of disarmament, problems of introducing effective control ?

Mr. Eisenhower, the President of the United States of America, recently suggested that technical experts should be instructed to agree on the forms for control to prevent any state from staging secret explosions of nuclear weapons.

Our attitude on this question has always been clear. Far from rejecting it in the past, we ourselves suggested the introduction of appropriate control over the observance of a possible agreement on the ending of atomic and hydrogen bomb tests. But we believed that, above all, agreement had to be reached on the main issue—the prohibition of tests—before taking up technical questions connected with this. However, since the United States administration believes that positive results can be produced sooner in this way, we have decided to meet them half way and are ready to nominate our experts without further delay and to instruct them to work out the necessary details on this question. We say to our partners: Let us try this possibility, too.

It is high time to embark upon a realistic road and, proceeding on the basis of the existing situation, on the basis of a sober analysis of the state of affairs, search for a solution to pressing problems on which acceptable agreements can be reached without violating anyone's security. Such an approach would, in our opinion, bring about a reduction of international tension, the ending of the "cold war" and the creation of conditions for the peaceful co-existence in which all the peoples of the world are so interested.

Comrades and Friends, the visit to the Soviet Union of President Nasser and his companions is drawing to a close. During these days our guests have been to a number of regions of the country and have seen what warm friendship and sincere sympathy the Soviet people entertain for the United Arab Republic and its freedom-loving people. We are happy about this visit, because we want more and more guests to come to us in order to study our life. Everything that they may consider useful, that suits them, can be used by them in the interests of their peoples. We are ready to share with our friends our experience, the achievements of science and culture, and technical and other knowledge, to share in a disinterested way, as real friends do.

During President Nasser's stay in our country meetings and discussions have been held on questions of interest to the governments of both countries. We have established that there is complete mutual understanding between the governments of our countries on all questions affecting mutual interests.

The results of our conversations are set forth in a joint statement.

President Nasser's visit to the U.S.S.R. is of great importance for the strengthening of peace in the Middle East and throughout the world.

We note with satisfaction that the successful development of economic and cultural co-operation between our countries, resting on the principles of equality and friendly co-operation, greatly benefits both the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic.

In strengthening the friendship between the peaceloving peoples we must always bear in mind that the imperialists have never abandoned and, it seems, will not abandon their attempts to disturb this friendship. We must display vigilance with regard to the imperialists' intrigues and must not allow them to disrupt the growing co-operation between the United Arab Republic, the Soviet Union and the other peaceloving countries.

We regard the visit to the Soviet Union of President Gamal Abdel Nasser and his companions as a valuable contribution to the strengthening of the friendship between the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic.

Let us further strengthen and expand the mutually beneficial economic and cultural relations between the Soviet Union and the United Arab Republic, the co-operation between our countries in an effort to ease international tension and strengthen world peace.

We sincerely wish our esteemed and distinguished guest, the national hero of the Arab people, the President of the United Arab Republic, Gamal Abdel Nasser, and his companions good health and success for the good of their country, for the benefit of world peace.

Long live Arab-Soviet friendship!

Long live world peace!

TASS STATEMENT ON LEBANON

May 19, 1958

IN connection with the events in recent days in Lebanon reports have been coming in about the attempts by certain foreign powers to make use of these events to interfere in the internal affairs of Lebanon and to exert pressure anew on the Arab states of the Middle East.

The facts prove that the powers concerned, making use of the Lebanese events, are weaving the web of another plot against peace and security in the Middle East. This time they have chosen Lebanon, a small Arab country, as the objective of their schemes.

Foreign press reports say that this is being manifested primarily in the fact that the Embassies of certain western powers in Beirut have come to resemble, not so much diplomatic representations in charge of the relations of their countries with the sovereign Lebanese state, as colonialist headquarters which enter into collusion with reactionary anti-national elements within the country, flagrantly interfere in the internal affairs of that country and try to order it about as if it were a colony.

The United States Sixth Fleet has been ordered to sail at full speed for Lebanese shores. The landing forces of the American command in the Mediterranean area are being hastily increased and preparations are being made for landing American units of Marines on the Lebanese coast. According to statements by representatives of the U.S. State Department, American arms are being sent to Lebanon to massacre the Arab civilian population in accordance with the tried and tested methods of the colonialists.

Press reports and statements by responsible officials make it clear that all this is being done under the false pretext that the present mass demonstrations of the Lebanese population against foreign interference in the country's affairs and in defence of its independence and its constitution, have been inspired by the United Arab Republic.

All these are well-known methods of

the colonialists, who have repeatedly strangled the freedom and independence of small countries merely because those countries have refused to submit to the yoke of foreign oppression. In the past such methods were used to unleash colonial robber wars. Today they are being used to impose on some of the small countries systems which are alien to the interests of their peoples, but advantageous to foreign capitalist monopolies and in line with the strategic plans of aggressive military blocs.

What is the reason for this intervention being prepared against a country whose government had given way to foreign pressure and declared its acceptance of the notorious " Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine " ?

The answer is easily found if an examination is made of the real motives, rather than the false assertions circulated by official American propaganda in order to justify the inadmissible actions of the United States and some of the other western powers with regard to Lebanon.

It is common knowledge that the " Dulles - Eisenhower doctrine " — that clear-cut programme for colonial plunder—has been rejected by the Arab peoples, who rightly regard it as being foreign to their real national interests and sovereignty.

Every day makes it clear that the authors of that doctrine are suffering new defeats in their attempts to stifle the national liberation movement of the peoples of the East and to retard the irresistible process of the peoples' complete liberation from the hated colonial domination.

Judging by all this, attempts are being made to revive this moribund doctrine, to " give it a shot in the arm." As for the choice of means to which the colonialists—both old and new—are resorting in order to attain this end, well, they have no little experience in such matters. But there is one thing they obviously do not take into account. They do not reckon with the fact that the time has passed when the old imperialist slogan: " Divide and conquer "—a slogan which was for many centuries the watchword of colonialists—could be successfully used.

The peoples who have secured their political independence want to use their riches at their own discretion and to pursue an independent policy in keeping with their national interests, without referring back to London or Washington.

In short, the peoples of the East want to live as the complete masters of their own homes, in peace and friendship with all peoples, and not in the way the organisers of N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O. and the Baghdad Pact—bound up as they are in their politics with the " cold war," the arms race and unrestrained expansion in relation to small countries and nations—would like them to live.

The actions of some western powers, and above all the United States, with regard to Lebanon, whose peaceful people want only one thing—to live in peace and friendship with their neighbours, the Arab states—is an expression of just this policy.

But it is precisely this that is in contradiction with the calculations of the colonialists, who want to bind Lebanon hand and foot, politically and economically.

The present developments in Lebanon permit us to draw another important conclusion.

It stands out that these events have started at a time when the dangerous hotbed of foreign interference in the internal affairs of Indonesia has not yet been eliminated, and when, before the eyes of the whole world, the imperialists are striving by means of blackmail and pressure, developing into open aggression, to suppress the resistance of the Indonesian people who are upholding their independence.

Now the imperialists have chosen Lebanon as a new objective of their intrigues and dangerous provocations, in an attempt to establish a colonialist régime in Lebanon and to deal a blow at the national liberation movement of all the Arab East.

Leading circles in the Soviet Union believe that the solution of questions relating to the Lebanese state is an inalienable right of the Lebanese people, and no other states have the right to interfere in these affairs. All attempts to use these or other internal develop-

ments in Lebanon for outside intervention create a dangerous situation in the Middle East and may have serious consequences, not only for the future of the Lebanese state and its independence, but also for peace in the Middle East.

Leading circles in the Soviet Union express confidence that no powers will resort to interference in the internal affairs of Lebanon, no matter in what form, or permit the creation of a dangerous hotbed of war in this area.

AGAINST INTERFERENCE IN LEBANESE INTERNAL AFFAIRS

Soviet Delegate's Speech in Security Council

June 10, 1958

IN June, the United Nations Security Council discussed the Lebanon's complaint alleging interference by the United Arab Republic in Lebanese internal affairs.

On June 10, Sweden tabled a draft resolution providing for setting up a special observer group on the frontiers of the Lebanon. The United States, British and Iraqi delegates urged that the Swedish draft resolution be adopted immediately.

The Soviet representative, A. A. Sobolev, said that the Soviet delegation wanted to study the draft first. The resolution should not be adopted in a hurry, he said. The council should continue the general discussion and at its next meeting begin examining the proposed resolution.

The meeting was adjourned until the evening, when the Soviet representative made a speech.

Sobolev pointed out in his speech that at the previous meeting of the council, the Lebanese Foreign Minister, Dr. Malik, had tried to show that the recent events in the Lebanon had been caused by interference by the United Arab Republic in the Lebanon's internal affairs.

"We listened attentively to his lengthy statement," the Soviet delegate said, "and we must frankly say that it did not convince us and did not substantiate the Lebanese government's complaint.

"In our opinion, to get a full idea of the Lebanese events and their causes, it is necessary to heed the voice of the Lebanese themselves, the voice of the Arabs.

"The whole world knows, and it is no secret, that in the Lebanon itself there are opinions as to the causes and nature of the events in that country that differ radically from those put forward in the council by Dr. Malik.

"In our opinion, it is impossible to make a correct assessment of the events in the Lebanon and of the reasons which prompted the Lebanese government to apply to the Security Council without acquainting ourselves with what the Lebanese themselves say."

Sobolev went on to quote a statement by Rafik Naja, president of the National Front party, published in the newspaper *Telegraph,* and a statement by former Foreign Minister Charles Helou, given in the newspaper *Beirut Al-Masa* on May 26.

Both Lebanese political leaders stressed that the events in the Lebanon were of a purely local nature and had no connection with the United Arab Republic or any other foreign power.

The same idea was contained in the statement by the noted Lebanese public figure Henri Pharaon, a big financier, published in the newspaper *L'Orient*. The Lebanese events were similarly assessed also by the Christian church leader, the Marconite Patriarch Meouchi.

These statements, Sobolev said, also showed that responsible Lebanese politicians and prominent representatives of the Lebanese people did not bear out what Dr. Malik had told the Security Council.

"Consequently," he added, "Dr. Malik was a sounding board for somebody else, and this somebody else, we believe, are the ruling circles of Britain and the U.S.A."

"What, then, has happened in the Lebanon, and what do these events, which have shaken the entire Lebanese people, mean?" Sobolev asked, and went on to say:

"It is known that the imperialist circles of a number of western countries have in recent years regarded the Lebanon as an important base for them in the Arab East. Yet, in the spring of 1957, the Lebanese government hastened to subscribe to the Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine, which has been rejected by the Arab peoples.

"Having entered into collusion with the United States, the Lebanese government rejected the policy of neutrality and of not taking part in aggressive military blocs, a policy which is followed by most Arab states. It started to pursue a policy cutting right across the decisions of the Bandung Conference, which the Lebanon was a party to.

"This led to the isolation of the Lebanon from the other Arab states, which, as such, played into the hands of the United States ruling circles, who are generally known to be trying to undermine Arab unity.

"In these conditions the deep indignation of the masses of the people in the Lebanon mounted rapidly; the last straw was the provocative assassination of Nasib Metni, owner and editor of the *Telegraph* and an outstanding patriot who fought for the Lebanon's independence. A broad popular movement for the Constitution, for national independence and against colonialism spread in the country.

"All sections of the population, irrespective of their religious affiliations, have rallied round the Lebanese Opposition. Its leaders include such eminent Lebanese figures as Bechar Al-Houry, ex-President of the republic, and former Prime Ministers Saeb Salam, Abdullah Yafi and Rachid Kerame.

"All these political leaders, guided as they were by the interests of the people, came out for the enforcement of the Constitution, for national independence and against foreign domination. It is they who protested to the United States Ambassador in the Lebanon and called for an end to American interference in the Lebanon's internal affairs.

"The current internal developments in the Lebanon are thus the result of popular anger and represent the organised struggle of the Lebanese people in defence of their constitutional rights.

"Having assessed the events in the Lebanon on the basis of factual evidence, the Soviet delegation considers that there is no excuse at all for any interference in the Lebanon's internal affairs from any quarter, including the Security Council.

"On the contrary, it is the responsibility of the Security Council to rebuff the attempts at outside interference in the internal affairs of the Arab countries.

"It is necessary to call this to mind since numerous facts indicate that certain western powers are attempting to exploit the current events in the Lebanon in order to interfere in its domestic affairs and to exert pressure on the Arab states.

"The facts show that these powers are hatching a new conspiracy against peace and security in the Middle East, having this time chosen the Lebanon as their main objective.

"These facts are common knowledge. They show that a danger of open foreign intervention, not from any of the Arab

states, but from the West, is hanging over the Lebanon. Particular activity is being shown by the ruling circles of the United States and Britain, who have agreed on common action with respect to the Lebanon, up to and including the landing of troops.

"The possibility of intervention has been bluntly admitted by official spokesmen of the United States and Britain. On May 15, U.S. Secretary of State Dulles told the Senate leaders representing both parties that the United States was prepared to land American armed forces on the coast of the Lebanon.

"What the United States is really getting ready to do in the Lebanon was confirmed in effect by Secretary of State Dulles at his press conference on May 20.

"The armed forces of the United States and Britain are being moved towards the Lebanese frontiers. The U.S. Sixth Fleet, whose landing forces have been doubled, was ordered on May 16 to head urgently for the Eastern Mediterranean and has since been cruising off the Lebanese coast. British ships, in their turn, hurriedly sailed from Malta to Lebanese waters. The paratroopers are in a state of combat readiness and, as the British military command has pointed out, can be dispatched at a moment's notice to the Middle East.

"The armed forces of the western powers are being massed on Cyprus, just as they were at the time of the preparations for the aggression against Egypt.

"According to statements by spokesmen of the U.S. State Department, American arms are being shipped to the Lebanon, including heavy weapons, artillery, tanks and aircraft, for suppressing the peaceful population. A large quantity of arms, as the press has reported, has already been taken to the Lebanon from American depots in Western Germany. Not only tear gas is used against the people who have risen up, but American tanks and artillery, rockets and napalm bombs are also used.

"It is not difficult to see that all these military operations are an obvious provocation and a direct preparation for armed intervention against the Lebanese people.

"These days of staunch struggle by the Lebanese people have persuaded the Arabs once again that the main purpose of the colonialist Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine is the suppression of the growing national liberation movement in the Arab East and the support of reactionary régimes in the interests of retaining the positions of the oil monopolies.

"The activity of the United States and Britain is explained, firstly, by the fact that the biggest oil pipelines of the American and British monopolies, with an annual capacity exceeding 30 million tons of oil, end on Lebanese territory, and, secondly, by the fact that the military commands of the United States and Britain attach tremendous importance to the Lebanon's key strategic position on the Eastern Mediterranean coast.

"An important role in preparing for the intervention against the Lebanon has been assigned by its organisers to the Baghdad bloc. It is known that the military committee of the Baghdad Pact decided, at its meeting on May 17 in Iraq, to support the Chamoun government in the struggle against the nationwide movement.

"According to reports in the Arab press, troops from the Baghdad bloc member-countries are being rushed by air to the Lebanon. It is reported that some 1,000 Iraqi officers and men, armed with sub-machine guns and tommy guns and supplied with ammunition, have already arrived in the Lebanon. Jordanian and Turkish officers in plain clothes are also being sent to Lebanese territory.

"The events in the Lebanon thus show that certain western powers and their lackeys in the Middle East are deliberately planning intervention against the Lebanese people. One cannot fail to see in all this also an endeavour to create conditions for the subsequent inclusion of the Lebanon in the Baghdad

Pact, a pact which has been rejected by the Arab peoples.

"Preparing military intervention against the Lebanon, the western powers seek to justify their actions under the false pretext that the mass actions of the Lebanese people are allegedly inspired by the United Arab Republic.

"The allegations of interference by the United Arab Republic have been denied also by quite a number of Lebanese Opposition leaders. Among others, one may cite a statement to the press by Saeb Salam, leader of the National Front of the Lebanon, and an article by Abdullah Yafi, a former Prime Minister of the Lebanon, published in the newspaper *Al-Siassa* on May 24.

"Thus, if the situation in the Lebanon is regarded objectively and these statements by prominent Lebanese leaders are given serious thought, it is not hard to agree with them that the Lebanese government, having come up against a grave international crisis and being unable to cope with it, is trying, by appealing to the Security Council, to impart an international character to purely internal events in the Lebanon.

"It is perfectly obvious that a settlement of the internal conflict in the Lebanon should be sought not in the Security Coucil but in the Lebanon itself.

"The application of the Lebanese government to the Security Council cannot be regarded in any other way than as an endeavour to get support in the struggle against its own people from certain western powers, members of the Security Council.

"Thus, the Lebanese government's complaint against the United Arab Republic looks more like a complaint against the Lebanese people, who have risen to defend their independence.

"Is there any need for further evidence to confirm the national liberation character of the movement of the Lebanese people, since it involves the broadest masses of the people and representatives of all sections of the population and of different religions?

"Furthermore, to leave no room for doubt as to who are the moving spirits behind the Lebanon's complaint to the Security Council, one can quote from the statement by Saeb Salam, one of the Lebanese Opposition leaders whom I have already mentioned, that if the Lebanese government turned to the Security Council, that would be done under the influence of Secretary of State Dulles and British Foreign Secretary Selwyn Lloyd.

"It is abundantly clear today that the Lebanese government's appeal to the Arab League was a tactic designed to fool the Arab peoples. The Lebanese government has twice postponed consideration of its complaint in the Security Council, trying to bring pressure to bear on the members of the Arab League.

"On the other hand, as soon as the possibility of a compromise agreement appeared in the course of the League's deliberations, the Lebanese government wrecked that agreement and brought its complaint before the Security Council.

"All this cannot but lead one to the conclusion that pressure is being brought to bear on the Lebanese government by the western powers, who are seeking to aggravate the situation in the Middle East and by no means to secure a peaceful settlement in the Lebanon.

"Nor can one fail to be surprised by the fact that the Lebanese Foreign Minister, instead of negotiating with the neighbouring Arab nations for whom he expressed his friendship at such length at the previous meeting, chose to go, not to Benghasi for the Arab League session, but to New York for the Security Council session, whose sponsors are out to sow the seeds of strife among the Arab peoples.

"The peoples of the Arab countries, just as those of the other countries of the world, realise that the danger of foreign interference and armed intervention from the West is hanging over the Lebanon and that drastic action is necessary to avert it.

"As for the Soviet Union, we consider it necessary to reaffirm what we

stated here at the previous meeting of the Security Council, that is:

To decide matters which concern the Lebanese state is the inalienable right of the Lebanese people and no one has any right to interfere in such affairs. All attempts to exploit the current internal events in the Lebanon in order to interfere from without create an explosive situation in the Middle East and can have grave consequences not only for the future of the Lebanese nation and its independence, but also for the destinies of peace in the Middle East.

"The government of the U.S.S.R. expresses the hope that none of the powers will risk interfering in any form whatsoever in the Lebanon's internal affairs or permit a dangerous centre of war to spring up in that area.

"The duty of the Security Council members in the present circumstances is, in the Soviet delegation's opinion, to prevent the implementation of plans for interference in the Lebanon's internal affairs and to prevent the events in the Lebanon from being exploited to harm the national interests of the Arab peoples.

"As for the Lebanese government's complaint, the Security Council should reject it as unfounded and unjustified."

The Swedish draft resolution was put to the vote at the end of the meeting and was supportd by 10 members of the Security Council. The Soviet Union abstained.

PREPARATIONS FOR AMERICAN AND BRITISH ARMED INTERVENTION IN THE LEBANON

Tass Statement, June 24

THERE have been increasingly frequent reports recently of the preparations being made by the ruling circles of the United States and Britian to start armed intervention in the internal affairs of the Lebanon. With this end in view, it is planned, in particular, to turn the group of United Nations observers despatched to the Lebanon into a United Nations police force. It is planned to increase the number of these observers considerably. Thus, dangerous plans are being hatched for foreign armed intervention in the Lebanon's internal affairs.

These plans are known to be openly proclaimed by the leading statesmen of the United States and Britain.

Thus, at a press conference on June 17, United States Secretary of States Dulles spoke of a need to have in the Lebanon somewhat different United Nations armed forces than initially planned, particularly as regards their numerical strength and composition. Moreover, Dulles stated openly that the United States intended to dispatch its forces to the Lebanon under the flag of the United Nations. He also stressed that the American troops could land in the Lebanon, not only at the request of the United Nations, but as a result of unilateral actions. In other words, all the world had been notified that the United States may start armed intervention against the Lebanon.

The following day, on June 18, President Eisenhower told press correspondents that, in view of the Lebanese events, the United States was ready to resort to military actions, and that the form of these actions depended on the opinion of the group of observers and the United Nations Secretary-General.

The French Minister, André Malraux, touching on the Lebanese events, said

that "if action is taken by the United States and Britain. France's position would most probably involve participation in them."

The British press openly says that the United States and Britain have drawn up plans for armed intervention in the Lebanon and are ready to stage a bloody massacre of the population of this Arab state. The *News Chronicle* even exposes some details of these plans, pointing out that, in the shape in which they are now, these plans provide for the landing in Beirut of 3,000 marines of the United States Sixth Fleet and a joint Anglo-American landing of paratroops.

Before the eyes of the world, American and British planes are constantly delivering arms and ammunition to the Lebanon. United States and British troops are being moved to the eastern shores of the Mediterranean. Ships of the United States Sixth Fleet and British warships, including the aircraft carrier *Ark Royal,* are already off the shores of the Lebanon.

United States Secretary of Defence McElroy came out with an open threat to use atomic weapons against the Arab peoples. On June 19, he said that he would not hesitate to use bombers with "more or less clean" atomic bombs in the Middle East, were the United States forces to intervene in the Lebanon.

It is in place to remind the American Minister that in olden times there was a good custom in Rome; before taking an important decision the Romans took a cold shower. Did the United States Secretary of Defence follow this example? If not, it would perhaps have been advisable for Mr. McElroy to have followed this Roman custom before deciding to make such a statement.

It is not concealed in reliable western circles that all the aforementioned military preparations of the United States and Britain are calculated to carry out the operation of intervening in the Lebanon's internal affairs as quickly as possible, thereby confronting the world with an accomplished fact. In order to condition public opinion in their countries to this criminal act of aggression, the official press in the N.A.T.O. countries is persistently circulating versions alleging intervention by the United Arab Republic in Lebanese affairs.

The western press openly points out that the preparations for intervention against the Lebanon were preceded by an Anglo-American collusion, that the main subject of the recent talks between President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan was the adjustment of the plans for aggression against the Lebanon. Far from refuting this, the governments of the United States and Britain actually confirm it. It is not fortuitous that the aforementioned statements of the leading statesmen of the United States were made immediately after the conclusion of this meeting.

All this shows that the ruling circles of the United States and some other western countries are intending, either under the guise of United Nations armed forces or without any cloak at all, to move their troops into the Lebanon and occupy the country. At present they are only seeking for a pretext to start intervention against the Lebanese people, who are fighting for their independence, against the interference of the colonialists in Lebanese affairs, against foreign *diktat.*

A legitimate question arises of whether some western powers which have still not renounced their former policy of colonialist pillage do not want to revenge themselves for the failure of the aggression against Egypt and the projected venture against Syria. But experience shows that these calculations are built on sand. It goes without saying that foreign intervention against the Lebanon would above all serve to expose once again the aggressive and expansionist plans of the western powers as regards the Arab nations. And if the past actions of these powers have heaped up mountains of hatred for the colonialists among the Arab peoples there can be no doubt that any new aggression against the Arab peoples would greatly increase this hatred, which would continue for many generations to come. The bombs and guns of the interventionists would kill not only the citizens of the Lebanon, but

would finally smash to smithereens faith in the West's good intentions as regards the peoples of the East, that is, the illusions which some people still have on this score.

It is no secret that certain circles in the United States have long been nurturing plans for interference in the internal affairs of the Lebanon and intend to use for that purpose first of all the colonialist "Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine."

Expressing the will of the people, a number of prominent politicians and statesmen in the Lebanon have condemned these plans of the colonialists. Thus, the Speaker of the Lebanese Parliament, Adel Osseiran, has declared that the Lebanese people will not allow any foreign armed forces, whether of the United Nations or of any foreign power, to land in the Lebanon. At the same time he emphasised that the arrival in the Lebanon of United Nations observers must not be a prelude to the landing of foreign troops.

The leader of the Moslem Najjade party, Adnan Hakim, declared that "if Hammarskjoeld's arrival in the Lebanon is a preparation for the landing in the country of the international police forces, we shall tell him the following: Go back to your country. We do not wish anyone to interfere in our country's internal affairs, and we shall struggle against all those who try to send foreign troops to the Lebanon."

The leader of the Lebanese National Front party, Member of Parliament Raymond Edde, declared that foreign armed interference in Lebanese internal affairs under any pretext whatsoever may undermine the cause of peace in the Middle East and all over the world.

Plans for armed interference in the Lebanon's internal affairs have aroused profound indignation not only in the Lebanon itself and not only in the Arab countries, but also in many other countries, both in the East and in the West. And this is understanable, since foreign armed intervention in the Lebanon would be a challenge not only to the Lebanese people, not only to the peoples of the Arab East defending their independence, but to the forces of peace throughout the world. That is why it is the duty of every state and every government which feels genuine concern for peace to do everything possible to prevent the aggression against the Lebanon. The United Nations, established for the purpose of maintaining international security, must not be allowed to be used in any manner whatsoever by the enemies of peace as a cover for their aggression against the Lebanon.

The United Nations observers group sent to the Lebanon in accordance with a decision of the Security Council, cannot perform the functions other than those provided for in the decision of the Security Council and that of supplying the pertinent information. It cannot and has no right to interfere in the internal affairs of the country and its people.

The plans for intervention in the Lebanon once again show that the forces which have strongly bound up their policy with a continuation of the "cold war," and an aggravation of international tension regard the Middle East as an object of constant imperialist intrigues and dangerous provocations. Before one hotbed of such provocations has time to disappear a new one makes its appearance which is not less but even more dangerous than the fomer.

In connection with the threat of armed intervention by the western powers in the Lebanon, official circles in the Soviet Union believe that the attempts by some states to intervene with arms in the Lebanon, under any pretext whatsoever, constitute a gross violation of the principles of the United Nations and a mockery of these principles. Deciding the problems pertaining to the Lebanese state is the inalienable right of the Lebanese people alone. No internal events in the Lebanon can serve as a pretext for external interference in its domestic affairs. Attempts at armed interference by the western powers in the Lebanon's internal affairs would inevitably lead to a serious aggravation of the international situation and would jeopardise the cause of peace. The entire

responsibility for this would fall squarely on the organisers and participants in this intervention.

As for the Soviet Union, it has repeatedly stated that it stands for peace in the Middle East, which is in proximity to the frontiers of the U.S.S.R. That is why the Soviet Union, this time as well, cannot ignore the preparations for foreign intervention in the Lebanon, no matter how that intervention may be veiled.

Soviet Representative's Statement in the Security Council on the Situation in the Lebanon

USSR Resolution on July 15

The following statement on the situation in the Lebanon was made by Arkady Sobolev, the U.S.S.R. representative, at the meeting of the U.N. Security Council on July 15:

AT the request of the United States delegation, the Security Council has again been convened to examine the Lebanese question.

It will be recalled that the Security Council had already examined the Lebanese complaint, containing an accusation against the United Arab Republic alleging intervention in the affairs of Lebanon. However, the United Nations observers' team, sent to Lebanon in accordance with a resolution of the Security Council, did not confirm these accusations lodged against the United Arab Republic.

Furthermore, it should be added that the United Nations Secretary-General, in his statements, has also repeatedly stressed that the events taking place in Lebanon are an internal affair of the Lebanese people.

Now, what has occasioned in this case the United States' urgent request that a meeting of the Security Council be called?

The facts show that a civil war is actually taking place in Lebanon. Indignant at the reactionary and anti-popular policy of the Chamoun government, the people of Lebanon have risen in defence of their constitutional rights and the independence of their country.

It is common knowledge that certain western powers have long been trying to use the events in Lebanon for armed intervention against the Lebanese people. United States and British leaders have openly spoken of the readiness of their governments to send their armed forces to Lebanon under any pretext. It is enough to recall the press conference of U.S. Secretary of State Dulles on June 17, when he plainly spoke of the United States' intention to send its armed forces to Lebanon, stressing that the American troops could be landed there not only under the United Nations flag but also by unilateral actions. Things have gone so far that United States Defence Secretary McElroy permitted himself to threaten the use of atom bombs.

Thus, the facts irrefutably show that Lebanon has been threatened and is being threatened not by the United Arab Republic's non-existent interference in its affairs, but by the direct military intervention of the United States and its western partners, who are trying by force of arms to retain a government in power in Lebanon whose policy is resolutely rejected by the entire people there.

It is no secret that the United States and the other western powers counted on succeeding in using the United Nations observers, sent to Lebanon, to justify their plans of intervention against the Arab peoples. Their hopes, however,

have not materialised. The observers' team have taken an objective stand and have justly assessed the events taking place in Lebanon as a purely internal affair of the Lebanese people.

Yesterday the events in Iraq, where the power of King Feisal has been overthrown and the Iraqi Republic proclaimed, were added to the events in Lebanon.

The Iraqi events are a purely internal affair of the Iraqi people, who have risen against foreign oppression and have liberated their country from King Feisal's reactionary power, which has outlived itself.

All these facts show that the peoples of the Arab world, who have taken the road of national liberation, are striving to uphold their political independence, want to dispose of their wealth themselves, and are pursuing a policy conforming to their national interests, without looking either to London or Washington. In short, the peoples of the East want to live as rightful masters of their homes, in peace and friendship with all nations, and not as the organisers of N.A.T.O., S.E.A.T.O. and the Baghdad Pact, who have firmly bound up their policy with the "cold war," arms stockpiling and unrestrained expansion with regard to the small countries and peoples, would like things to be. But this is exactly what is not reckoned with by the colonialists, who would like to tie the peoples of the Arab East hand and foot, politically and economically.

The reaction of United States political circles to the Iraqi events shows that the very existence of the aggresive military blocs in the Middle East, and the Baghdad Pact first and foremost, is at stake. At the same time the Iraqi events threaten the undivided rule of the imperialist states over the economy of that country.

It is with good reason that the United States' and Britain's particular sensitivity to the Iraqi events is explained, according to press reports, by the demands of the big American and British oil monopolies that vigorous measures be taken to suppress the strivings of the Iraqi people to become the real masters of their destiny, of their wealth and their state.

We have just heard a statement by the representative of the United States on the landing of its troops on the territory of Lebanon. The United States has decided to intervene openly with its armed forces in the internal affairs of the Arab countries and bring to their knees the peoples not only of Lebanon but also of the other Arab states who have risen in defence of their freedom and independence.

In justification of these aggressive actions, the United States delegate refers to a "request" of the present rulers of Lebanon, but it is perfectly clear to all that these rulers are merely political puppets of the United States and that these requests, moreover, are inspired by the U.S. State Department.

In these conditions the sending of United States troops to Lebanon is an act of aggression against the peoples of the Arab world and gross intervention in the domestic affairs of the states of this area. This action is a flagrant violation of the United Nations Charter, which prohibits the use of force as an instrument of foreign policy, and runs counter to the principles and standards of international law and is a challenge to all freedom-loving mankind. No references to requests from Chamoun can justify this act of armed aggression, for those requests were inspired precisely to cover up United States intervention in the domestic affairs of states of the Arab world.

In "substantiation" of its intervention, the United States also refers to the United Nations Charter. It is known that the Charter provides for the right of individual or collective defence if an armed attack occurs against a member of the United Nations, until the Security Council has taken measures necessary to maintain international peace and security. But this reference has no bearing on the matter, and is merely a manoeuvre to cover up the aggressive nature of armed intervention against the Arab peoples. Lebanon is threatened by no one, except those who carry out

military intervention designed to crush the peoples who have risen up.

The delegation of the Soviet Union holds that the attempt of the United States to cover up armed intervention against the peoples of the Middle East by "reference to self-defence" is a mockery of the United Nations Charter and of the noble principles and purposes which underlie our organisation and are expressed in the United Nations Charter.

Settlement of questions pertaining to the Lebanese state, just as to the Iraqi state, is the inalienable right of the peoples of these countries. Some domestic event or other in these countries cannot serve as a pretext for outside intervention in their domestic affairs, and any armed intervention by the western powers is fraught with the gravest consequences, sharply exacerbating the international situation and capable of plunging the world into the abyss of another war.

Full responsibiilty for these consequences rests with the organisers and participants of the armed intervention against the peoples of the Arab East, and with the government of the United States first and foremost.

As for the Soviet Union, as has already been repeatedly stated, it wants peace to prevail in the Middle East area, situated, as it is, near the frontiers of the U.S.S.R. That is why the Soviet Union cannot regard with indifference foreign intervention in the countries of this area, no matter how this intervention is disguised.

It is the duty of every state and every government really concerned over the preservation of peace to do everything possible to cut short the aggression against the peoples of this area. The Security Council, proceeding from the duties with which it is entrusted by the U.N. Charter as regards the maintenance of peace and security, must take resolute measures to stop the aggression against the Arab countries and to ensure peace and tranquillity in this area of the world.

The Soviet delegation is submitting the following draft resolution:

"The Security Council,

"Having heard the statement of the delegate of the United States on the introduction of American armed forces within the frontiers of Lebanon, recognising that such actions are a gross intervention in the domestic affairs of the peoples of the Arab countries and, in view of this, run counter to the purposes and principles of the United Nations enunciated in its Charter, specifically in Paragraph 7 of Article 2, prohibiting intervention in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state,

"Taking into account the fact that the actions of the United States represent a serious threat to international peace and security,

"Urges the government of the United States to stop the armed intervention in the domestic affairs of the Arab states and to withdraw its troops at once from the territory of Lebanon."

The Soviet delegation calls upon all members of the Security Council to support this draft resolution. Its adoption by the Council would be a step aimed at putting an end to the gross intervention in the domestic affairs of the Arab states, at removing the real threat of war.

SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S STATEMENT ON EVENTS IN THE MIDDLE EAST

July 16, 1958

ON July 15 the whole world learned with indignation of the armed intervention by the United States of America in Lebanon. Ships of the United States Sixth Fleet entered the port of Beirut and landed marines on the territory of Lebanon.

On the same day the White House—in the name of the President of the United States—issued a statement attempting somehow to justify this flagrant military intervention in Lebanon's internal affairs. The statement alleges that the United States has sent its troops to Lebanon to demonstrate United States concern for the integrity and independence of Lebanon, which, so it claims, are being threatened from without, and also to protect American citizens in that country.

The complete absence of any grounds for this contention is self-evident, for no one is threatening Lebanon's integrity and independence. Abundant evidence of this is provided, for example, by the statement of the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld, and by the report of United Nations observers on the situation in Lebanon. As for "concern" for the safety of American citizens, one may be permitted to ask what standards of international law allow foreign powers to send their armed forces to the territories of other states for such purposes. There are no such standards in international law. It is common knowledge, however, that references to the need to protect their citizens have, from time immemorial, been a favourite device of all colonialists to justify gangster-like attacks on small countries.

The real reason for United States armed intervention in Lebanon is the desire of the oil monopolies of the United States and other western powers to retain their colonial hold on countries of the Middle East, and also the obvious bankruptcy of their policy in the Arab East and the collapse of the Baghdad Pact and of the notorious Dulles-Eisenhower doctrine.

This is borne out in a striking way by the latest events in Iraq, which the White House statement regards as a reason which speeded up armed intervention by the United States. However, the events in Iraq are fresh proof of the Arab peoples' unflinching determination to rid themselves of colonial dependence and to take their destiny into their own hands.

It is well known that on the night of July 13 to 14, the monarchy in Iraq was overthrown by the army, supported by the people ; a republic was proclaimed and a government of the Republic of Iraq was set up.

The first acts of this government, led by General Abdel Kerim Kassem, in the sphere of foreign policy were statements expressing full support for the principles of the Bandung Conference, withdrawal from the aggressive military Baghdad Pact, and recognition of the United Arab Republic.

The government of the Republic of Iraq declared that it would "act in accordance with the principles of the United Nations," would "follow an Arab policy and strictly abide by the decisions of the Bandung Conference," and that it was prepared "to honour commitments and treaties springing from the interests of the motherland." It also announced that it guaranteed the security of foreign nationals and their property.

These actions are evidence of the government's intention to defend the country's national independence and to strive, together with the other freedom-loving Arab peoples, to overcome the grievous aftermath of colonialism, to develop the national economy and to raise the living standards of the people.

It is natural that the policy statements of the government of the Republic of

Iraq, being in accordance as they are with the desires of the Iraqi and all other Arab peoples, should meet with unanimous support, both in Arab countries and in all peaceloving countries which regard the establishment of a republic as an entirely internal affair of the people of Iraq.

This turn in events in the Middle East obviously does not suit the colonial powers, which received the news of the establishment of the Republic of Iraq with undisguised hostility. Feverish activity began immediately in Washington, London and Ankara.

The existence of plans for large-scale intervention by the colonial powers in the internal affairs of countries of the Arab East is also borne out by the statement by the British Foreign Secretary, Mr. Selwyn Lloyd, that the British government had been informed in advance of the United States government's intention to land its troops in Lebanon, that the British government fully supported this action of the United States and that the British armed forces in the area were being kept ready.

In order to provide a pretext for armed intervention in the internal affairs of the Arab countries a statement by the Lebanese President Chamoun asking the governments of the United States, Britain and France to send troops to Lebanon, was inspired. It is well known, however, that the present events in Lebanon are a result of purely internal causes and that only interference by countries of the Baghdad Pact and the United States, seeking to preserve an anti-national régime at any cost, has led to civil war and to a worsening of the entire situation in the area.

It should be noted that the landing of American troops in Beirut is an act of armed intervention, not only against Lebanon, but also against all the freedom-loving Arab countries. No bones are made about this in, for instance, the aforementioned White House statement, which—certainly not by accident — links the dispatch of troops to Lebanon directly with the events in Iraq. This is also borne out by the fact that King Hussein of Jordan, obviously on advice from his patrons, has proclaimed himself the head of the now non-existent Iraqi-Jordanian federation in place of King Feisal, deposed by the Iraqi people, even though he had neither substantive nor formal grounds for this. The provocative nature of this step is self-evident, and the fact is being ignored that the government of the Republic of Iraq, supported by the whole of the people, has officially announced Iraq's withdrawal from the Iraqi-Jordanian federation.

Armed intervention by the United States in Lebanon shows clearly that the imperialists have cast off their disguise and have begun open aggression against peaceloving Arab peoples. In this connection it becomes particularly clear why the government of the United States did not accept the Soviet government's proposal of February 11, 1957, concerning non-interference by the great powers in the internal affairs of the countries of the area. The government of the United States refused to undertake commitments which would have ensured peace and eased the tension in that part of the world.

It wanted to keep its hands free for aggression in the area.

United States armed intervention in Lebanon creates a grave threat to peace and is fraught with far-reaching consequences. The peoples cannot remain unconcerned in face of this brazen imperialist aggression, this gross encroachment on the sovereignty and national independence of the Arab countries and this unceremonious violation of the principles of the United Nations.

The White House plea that American troops are being sent to Lebanon for purposes of self-defence and in the national interests of the United States is open mockery of these principles. Who does not know that the United States lies thousands of kilometres from Lebanon and that the people of Lebanon and other Arab countries can in no way threaten either the national interests or the security of the United States ? As for Lebanon, it is precisely American armed intervention that is the main threat to the security of this small Arab country.

Having taken to the road of flagrant

violation of the United Nations Charter, the government of the United States is now attempting to confront the Security Council and the whole of the United Nations with a *fait accompli* and to bring pressure to bear on the United Nations to make it approve the unilateral aggressive actions of the U.S.A.

The Soviet government considers that the situation in the Middle East—a situation created by open aggression on the part of the United States, supported by other colonial powers—is an alarming one and is dangerous to world peace. In these circumstances, the Security Council and the United Nations General Assembly should take urgent and vigorous measures to curb aggression and to protect the national independence of Arab states which have fallen victim to an unprovoked attack.

The Soviet government urges the government of the United States to cease its armed intervention in the internal affairs of Arab countries and to withdraw its troops from Lebanon immediately.

The Soviet government declares that the Soviet Union cannot remain indifferent to events creating a grave menace in an area abutting on its frontiers, and reserves the right to take the necessary measures dictated by the interests of peace and security.

SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S STATEMENT ON UNITED STATES AND BRITISH AGGRESSION IN MIDDLE EAST

July 18, 1958

ON July 17, the government of the United Kingdom committed an act of armed aggression against Jordan—British airborne units landed in the Jordan capital, Amman.

Attempting to justify this open armed intervention in the internal affairs of this Arab state, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan, insisted in the House of Commons that it was undertaken to help the Jordan government to resist aggression, although it is common knowledge that Jordan is threatened by no one, and the British Prime Minister was unable to give any facts or instances testifying to the existence of such a danger. The British Prime Minister said further that these actions of the British government were fully supported and approved by the government of the United States. Thus, the British government has supported the United States' aggression, while the government of the United States supports Britain's aggression.

Britain's intervention in Jordan, undertaken right after the American invasion of Lebanon, shows that the governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have a broadly conceived plan of aggressive actions to supress the national liberation movement in the Arab East. They want to impose the yoke of colonialism on the peoples once again and to retain the possibility for American and British monopolies to continue plundering the natural resources and manpower of these countries.

By their decision on armed intervention in Jordan, the ruling circles of Britain, pretending to help King Hussein, are attempting to regain their colonialist positions in the country, which were forfeited to a considerable extent in 1956 when, on the demand of the Jordan people, the British military advisers, headed by Glubb Pasha, who actually controlled the Jordan army, were expelled from the country.

It can be seen from the British Prime Minister's statement that the purpose of Britain's armed intervention in Jordan is

not only to suppress the movement of the Jordan people for their independence, but to entrench iself in Jordan and use this country, along with American-occupied Lebanon, as a military base for the suppression of the popular revolution in Iraq. At present the United States and Britain are hastily conditioning public opinion to the further extension of the American-British armed intervention against the nations of the Arab East.

One cannot fail to see that the governments of the United States and Britain have embarked upon the road of armed interference in the internal affairs of other countries, a practice categorically prohibited by international law and the United Nations Charter.

This path of military ventures is fraught with the gravest consequences for peace, and those who embark upon it must realise that the peoples will make them answer for these aggressive actions. Who better than the British government should realise, particularly after the shameful failure of the military venture against Egypt, that the time has gone forever when the fire of colonialist gunboats and the landing of armed detachments in this or that colonial or dependent country could crush the uprisings of the oppressed peoples and save the colonialist regimes.

Today, when hundreds of millions of formerly oppressed colonial peoples have started a struggle for their national rights, any attempts to prevent these nations from achieving their independence are doomed to failure. The sacred right of the peoples to shape their life as they think fit is proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations, which was signed also by the United States and Britain.

The United States and British governments have broken their commitments to the United Nations and have come out as violators of peace.

The aggressors should bear in mind that all the peoples, particularly the Moslem population in the Middle East and the adjacent areas, will not be indifferent to the fate of the peoples who have fallen victim to foreign armed intervention. The peoples of the Arab East are not alone in their struggle for independence and freedom, against the criminal actions of the American and British colonialists.

The peoples of the entire world condemn with wrath and indignation the American and British aggressors. A wave of protest against the bloody venture of the United States and British ruling circles in the Middle East has surged throughout the world, including Britain herself. The peoples demand an immediate end to the armed intervention of the United States and Britain, they demand the withdrawal of the American and British troops from Lebanon and Jordan.

The governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have committed hostile acts against peace and they bear the responsibility for the consequences of their acts of aggression against Lebanon and Jordan.

The governments of the United States and the United Kingdom must end their armed intervention in the internal affairs of the Arab States and withdraw their troops at once from Lebanon and Jordan.

The Soviet government believes that at this crucial moment the Security Council and the United Nations General Assembly must fulfil their duty of safeguarding peace, must curb the aggression, uphold the national independence of the Arab states which have fallen victim to an unprovoked attack, and must stamp out the hotbed of war.

The Soviet government declares that the Soviet Union will not remain indifferent to the acts of unprovoked aggression in an area adjacent to its frontiers, and that it will be compelled to take the necessary steps dictated by the interests of the Soviet Union's security and of safeguarding world peace.

July 18, 1958.

N. S. KHRUSHCHOV'S MESSAGES TO HEADS OF GOVERNMENT

July 19, 1958

THE permanent representative of the U.S.S.R. at the United Nations, Arkady Sobolev, forwarded to the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Dag Hammarskjoeld, the texts of the messages sent by N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, to the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower; the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan; the Prime Minister of France, General de Gaulle; and the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru, in connection with American and British aggression in the Middle East.

Arkady Sobolev's letter to Mr. Hammarskjoeld said:

"The Soviet government hopes that you, as the Secretary-General of the United Nations, will support the proposal to convene a heads of government conference at Geneva on July 22, and will take part in this conference and make your contribution to the positive solution of this question."

Sobolev requested that the texts of N. S. Khrushchov's messages should be circulated among all United Nations members as documents of the United Nations Organisation.

Message to Prime Minister Macmillan

MR. PRIME MINISTER,

At this historic hour the world is on the brink of war catastrophe and any imprudent move, however slight, may entail irreparable consequences.

At this hour, when British and American forces have already invaded the small Arab states, Jordan and Lebanon, when a danger of intervention is hanging over Iraq and other Arab states upholding their independence and freedom, I wish to address you, as head of the government of the United Kingdom.

You, as a man with a vast knowledge of life and experience of statesmanship, know well what modern war means. Having broken out at one point, it can easily flare up, like a fire in a strong wind, and grow into a world conflagration. All talk of "little" or "local" wars in these conditions is no more than a naive illusion and all hope for a limited nature of military operations is deception or self-deception.

Those who are at the helm at this juncture have no right to forget the past. The first links in the chain of events that led up to the Second World War were also "little" and "local" wars and the seizure of alien territories.

We, as wartime allies in the past, know what the blood and ruins of the last war looked like, and we know how the aggressors' attempts to impose their will on other nations by force of arms ended. The lessons of history must not be forgotten, and we have no right to forget them.

The armed intervention, launched by Britain in Jordan and by the United States in Lebanon, and the danger hanging over Iraq and other Arab states can entail extremely dangerous and unpredictable consequences and set off a chain reaction which it will be impossible to arrest.

We address you, not from positions of intimidation, but from positions of reason. If there can be any talk of intimidation, then we should say that it is what high-ranking military leaders of the United States are so assiduously en-

gaged in now. The Commander of the United States Sixth Fleet and the Secretary for Defence are making such provocative and warmongering speeches that, if they were citizens of the countries which have banned war propaganda, they would have long ago been put on trial or, if they had gone mad, confined in a lunatic asylum.

Intimidation is, however, a useless means of carrying on international relations. We know that Britain and the United States have atom and hydrogen bombs, aircraft and navies. But you are also well aware that the Soviet Union also has atom and hydrogen bombs, aircraft and a navy, plus ballistic missiles of all types, including intercontinental ones. However, we believe that the atmosphere, which is sufficiently inflammable as it is, should not be brought to flash point. It is necessary to seek different solutions, realistic ways, guided not by military gambles but by common sense and negotiations. The interests of Britain herself, in our view, demand this by no means to a lesser degree than the interests of all mankind craving for peace and tranquillity.

You explain the military intervention in Jordan as a request of the King of Jordan to render him support in resisting aggression. But you know very well that no one is threatening Jordan and there are no facts which would indicate the existence of a threat.

The military invasion of Jordan by Britain has been launched at the request of an irresponsible monarch who does not enjoy the support of the people and acts against the will of the people. And such a request was enough for British troops to be sent into Jordan, in circumvention of the United Nations, which was informed *post factum* of this aggressive act.

Thus, the unprovoked aggression against Jordan is being concealed, in a rather crude manner, by the request of a government which—and this is no secret to anyone—is dependent upon Britain.

Prime Minister, you should be well aware that it is not yet two years since the time when, under pressure of the Jordan people, British troops were turned out of Jordan under the same reigning king. Now he is asking for Britain's troops to be moved in again. One can imagine how indignant the population was at the reappearance of British officers and men in Jordan.

Prime Minister, you often make public speeches in support of the United Nations, but by their actions in Jordan and Lebanon the governments of Britain and the United States are dealing a grave blow at this international organisation. At this hour, so vital to the lives of the peoples, the United Nations is, in effect, put off the scene by the bayonets of British and American troops.

Britain and the United States are trying to justify the armed invasion of the Arab states by referring to the need to protect the lives and property of British subjects and American nationals there. But this method of covering up aggression and seizing alien territories is not new.

The powers which have started the aggression are playing with fire. It is always easier to kindle the fire than to put it out. But once it has been kindled, it is better to put it out at the very outset, rather than let the flames flare up and envelope neighbouring houses. The only correct decision in the present circumstances would be to withdraw British and American troops from the Middle East at once and to afford the peoples of the countries of that area the opportunity of settling their own destinies.

In this crucial hour of history, when there is not a minute to be lost, the Soviet Union, invariably acting for world peace and peaceful co-existence, cannot be indifferent to what is happening in the Middle East, which is in direct proximity to its frontiers. The Soviet Union cannot be indifferent at a time when the question whether there will be war or peace is being decided.

I think, Prime Minister, that the bitter and grave experience which Britain had as a result of her unprovoked attack on Egypt has left a mark on the heart of every Briton deep enough to make it clear what grave consequences Britain's

participation in the new military adventure can entail for the people of Britain.

The government of the Soviet Union proposes an immediate meeting of the heads of government of the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, the United States, France and India, with the participation of the United Nations Secretary-General, in order to take immediate measures for ending the armed conflict which has broken out. We propose that we should meet on any day and at any hour, the sooner, the better. You certainly understand that history has allotted us little time to prevent war, to prevent the annihilation of millions of human beings, to prevent the destruction of immense material and cultural values.

In its statements the government of the Soviet Union has already made its position clear enough as regards the peaceful solution of the pressing problems of the Middle East. The Soviet Union considers that solutions to these problems can and must be found such as would meet the vital interests of the peoples of the Middle East and ensure respect for their sovereign rights, with due regard for the interests of all nations associated with the countries of that area.

The governments of the western powers say that they are interested in using oil and other raw material resources of that part of the world. But the peoples of those countries do not deny them that opportunity. The only thing they want is to have this problem solved on terms of equality and on a mutually beneficial commercial basis, which is the most reasonable one.

The Soviet government considers that a conference of the heads of government of the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, the United States, France and India could also take up the question of ending arms deliveries to the countries of the Middle East, as the U.S.S.R. had suggested earlier.

We consider it necessary that a conference of the heads of government of the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, the United States, France and India, having drawn up concrete recommendations on ending the armed conflict in the Middle East, should submit these recommendations to the Security Council and that this United Nations body should consider them, with the participation of representatives from Arab countries.

The question of the date and place of the conference cannot constitute any obstacle. The Soviet government is willing to have the conference held anywhere, should Geneva or the capital of some other neutral nation prove unsuitable to the western powers for some reason or other. The most important thing is to waste no time, for time is precious, as the guns are already beginning to fire. We propose that we should meet in Geneva on July 22.

A conference of the heads of government of the great powers to resolve the armed conflict which has broken out in the Middle East would be the most reasonable act for the governments of our countries to undertake in the present conditions. It would be an inestimable contribution to the cause of strengthening international peace and security. It would be incontestable evidence that the idea of peaceful and not military solutions can and must prevail throughout the world. An end to the aggression in the Middle East would be enthusiastically welcomed by the peoples of all countries, whatever their colour, creed or political convictions.

I should like to close by emphasising that whether the Middle East conflict will be resolved by war or by peaceful means now depends on the government headed by you, Prime Minister, on yourself and on the President of the United States.

The Soviet government expects that the government of the United Kingdom will understand this message of the Soviet government correctly and that it will have a positive response from the United Kingdom and she will be ready to turn the tide of events radically from the road of war to the road of peace.

On the foregoing subject I have

simultaneously addressed the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, the Prime Minister of France, General de Gaulle, and the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru.

Respectfully yours,

N. KHRUSHCHOV

Moscow. July 19, 1958

Message to President Eisenhower

July 19, 1958

MR. PRESIDENT,

The course of recent events shows that we are now living through one of the most crucial moments in history and that the world has been brought to the brink of a catastrophe. Men and women on all continents are filled with alarm and the masses of the people are beginning to stir, realising as they do that a military conflagration, wherever it begins, may spread to the entire world.

As allies in past battles, we know, although in different degrees, what the blood and ruins of the last world war were like. We realise what horrors a new war can bring to mankind, and we have no moral right to play with fire in the powder magazine into which the world has been transformed because of the arms race.

Under these conditions the armed intervention started by the United States in Lebanon, and then by Britain in Jordan, and the danger of intervention looming large over Iraq and all the states of the Arab world, may bring about extremely dangerous and unpredictable consequences and set off a chain reaction which it would be impossible to halt.

We are addressing you, not from positions of intimidation, but from positions of reason. If there can be any talk of intimidation, it should be with reference to the irresponsible military leaders of the United States, such as the commander of the American Sixth Fleet, who are now assiduously engaged in it. With a zeal worthy of a better cause, he is making such provocative speeches that if he were a citizen of a country which had prohibited war propaganda, he would have been brought before a court of law, or given a medical examination and placed in a lunatic asylum, because such statements can be made only by a criminal or by a person who has taken leave of his senses. The laurels of this naval commander have robbed the Defence Secretary of his sleep.

We know that the United States has atom and hydrogen bombs and we know that you have an air force and a navy. You, however, are also well aware that the Soviet Union, too, possesses atom and hydrogen bombs, an air force and a navy, plus ballistic missiles of all types, including intercontinental ones. However, we believe that at this momentous hour it would be more reasonable not to bring the heated atmosphere to flash point—it is sufficiently inflammable as it is. The statesmen of the countries must seek for solutions, not by means of fomenting war hysteria, but in a calm and reasonable way, so as to rule out war and ensure world peace.

What do the United States and Britain want to achieve by landing their forces in Lebanon and Jordan?

You explain the armed intervention in Lebanon by President Chamoun's request for help in combating aggression. But an internal struggle is going on in Lebanon, and the events in that country prior to the landing of the American troops could in no way be classed as direct or indirect aggression by other states, a fact that is confirmed by the United Nations observers and the United Nations Secretary-General. An internal struggle was going on there and you yourself have confirmed this.

The principle of other states not interfering in internal strife going on in this

or that country is a generally recognised standard of international law. It is not for me to tell you that the American people and their government categorically objected in the past to foreign interference in the American Civil War, in the struggle between the South and the North. Nor do I need even to mention the fact that in the case of Lebanon, the Lebanese President's appeal to the United States was not supported by the Lebanese Parliament, and the Speaker of the Parliament has strongly protested against American armed intervention. Consequently, the "invitation" sent by Chamoun has no constitutional validity.

The same situation prevails in Jordan, where British troops have been sent, not to uphold the interests of the people and the country, but to save the monarchy. The rulers of Lebanon and Jordan, who have lost the support of the people in their countries and who cannot rely on their armies, which refuse to support anti-national régimes, have decided to look for cover in the shadow of Anglo-American guns and to lean on the forces of intervention. But there has never yet been a case in history in which it has been possible to prop up a throne and government by bayonets, especially foreign ones. The 20th century leaves no room for illusions on this subject.

The military intervention of the United States and Britain in Lebanon and Jordan has been undertaken at the request of irresponsible rulers who do not enjoy the support of their peoples and are acting against their wishes. And such a request was enough for American and British troops to be sent to Lebanon and Jordan, in circumvention of the United Nations, which was informed *post factum* of this aggressive act.

It is also said that the American and British troops have invaded Lebanon and Jordan to defend the lives and property of American and British citizens there. But this is a very old trick of the colonialists. It will mislead no one, particularly because everyone knows that no foreigners, including American and British people, were injured or threatened either in Lebanon or Jordan.

You, Mr. President, often make public statements in support of the United Nations, but by their actions in Lebanon and Jordan the governments of the United States and Britain are dealing a heavy blow at this international organisation. At this momentous hour in the life of the peoples, the United Nations has actually been pushed out of the way by the bayonets of the American and British forces.

The aggressors are now playing with fire. It is always easier to start a fire than to put it out. But once it has been lit, it is better to put it out at the very beginning, rather than when the flames flare up and set neighbouring houses ablaze. The most correct solution in the present conditions would be to withdraw the occupation forces from the Middle East immediately and to give the peoples of that area an opportunity to decide their destiny for themselves.

In this grim moment in history, when there is not a minute to lose, the Soviet Union, invariably acting for world peace, against war, and for peaceful co-existence, cannot remain indifferent to what is happening in the Middle East, next to its frontiers. The Soviet Union cannot keep aloof at a time when the question of war or peace is being decided

This is why the government of the Soviet Union is proposing the immediate calling of a conference of the heads of government of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain, France and India, with the participation of the United Nations Secretary-General, in order to take urgent measures to end the military conflict that has begun. We propose that we should meet on any day, and at any hour—the sooner the better. You are perfectly well aware that history has left us a small margin in which to avert war, to prevent the annihilation of many millions of people, to prevent the destruction of great material and cultural values.

In its statements the government of the Soviet Union has set forth with ample clarity its views regarding the peaceful solution of urgent problems of the Middle East. The Soviet Union believes that a solution can and must be found which would meet the vital interests of

the peoples of the Middle East and ensure their sovereign rights, with due regard for the interests of all states associated with the countries of that area.

The governments of the western powers say that they are interested in using the oil and other raw material resources of that part of the world. But the peoples of that area are not denying the western powers this opportunity. They demand only one thing: that this problem be solved on an equitable and mutually beneficial commercial basis, which is the most reasonable basis.

The Soviet government believes that a conference of the heads of government of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain, France and India could also consider the question of ending deliveries of arms to the Middle East, as was earlier proposed by the U.S.S.R.

We consider it necessary that this summit conference should work out definite recommendations to end the military conflict in the Middle East and should submit them to the Security Council so that this United Nations body may study them with the participation of representatives from the Arab states.

The question of the date and place of this conference cannot be an obstacle to calling it. The Soviet government is prepared to agree to any place, including Washington, if for some reason Geneva or some other capital of a neutral country does not suit the western powers. The main thing is not to wait, not to waste precious time, because the guns are already beginning to speak. We propose that we should meet in Geneva on July 22.

The most reasonable action by our governments in the existing conditions would be to convene a summit conference to settle the military conflict which has broken out in the Middle East. This would be an inestimable contribution to the cause of strengthening peace and international security. This would be an irrefutable proof that the idea of the peaceful, and not military, settlement of questions can and must triumph throughout the world. The ending of aggression in the Middle East would be welcomed wholeheartedly by all peoples, whatever their colour, religious convictions or political views.

In conclusion I wish to lay special emphasis on the fact that the question of whether the conflict in the Middle East is settled through war or by peaceful means now depends on your government, on you personally, Mr. President.

The Soviet government expects that the government of the United States and you yourself, Mr. President, will understand this message of the Soviet government correctly and that it will meet with a favourable response from you and a readiness to turn the course of events radically from the road of war to the road of peace.

On this subject I have simultaneously approached the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of France, M. de Gaulle, and the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru.

Respectfully yours,

N. KHRUSHCHOV

Moscow. July 19, 1958.

Message to Prime Minister de Gaulle

MR. PRIME MINISTER,

At this crucial moment in history, when the world is on the brink of a war catastrophe and when the slightest imprudent step may lead to irreparable consequences, I wish to address this message to you as the head of the French government.

As a man with a wealth of military experience, you know full well what war is like, especially a war in present-day conditions. It is common knowledge that a war starting in one place may easily spread, just as a fire spreads in a strong wind, and turn into a world conflagration.

At this very hour American and British warships, planes and tanks have already invaded the small Arab states of Lebanon and Jordan. The danger of intervention is looming large over Iraq and all the states of the Arab East.

Trying to lull world public opinion, which has been filled with anxiety, the organisers of intervention are hastening to allege that they plan to restrict their actions to Lebanon and Jordan. But you well remember, of course, certain lessons of past history. When attacking Poland, Hitler also alleged that he intended to limit himself to military operations of a local nature. Yet what happened in actual fact? He first made short work of Poland, then of Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium, and then of France, after which he attacked the Soviet Union and the war turned into a world conflict. That war ended in a terrible catastrophe for the aggressor, but it also inflicted heavy losses on the countries which Hitler attacked.

These lessons of history must not be forgotten, and we have no right to forget them.

Wanting to intimidate the peoples and to bolster up their own courage, the present-day organisers of aggression are bragging that they are afraid of nothing and that they can conquer the whole world. The United States military leaders are most busily engaged in this irresponsible bluster. The commander of the United States Sixth Fleet and the U.S. Defence Secretary are making such provocative and inflammatory speeches that if they were citizens of countries where war propaganda is prohibited, they would be brought before a court of law, or put in a lunatic asylum, since they are acting as though they had taken leave of their senses.

However, intimidation is a worthless method in international relations. We know that the United States has atom and hydrogen bombs, an air force and a navy. But it is common knowledge that the Soviet Union also has atom and hydrogen bombs, an air force and a navy, plus ballistic rockets of all kinds, including intercontinental ones. However, we believe that it would be reasonable, at this crucial moment, not to bring the heated atmosphere to flash point—it is inflammable as it is. The leading statesmen of the countries should seek for solutions, not by means of fomenting war hysteria, but in a calm and reasonable way, so as to rule out war and ensure world peace.

That is why we are so surprised, frankly speaking, by the haste with which the official representatives of France have expressed solidarity with the aggressors and even tried to stage a military demonstration off the shores of Lebanon.

What were the aims of the United States and Britain when they landed their troops in Lebanon and Jordan? They claim that they were invited there by the President of Lebanon and the King of Jordan. But is such an "invitation" a lawful reason for military intervention? And in general, is there any justification at all for aggression? They refer to President Chamoun of Lebanon. But the people of Lebanon have risen against this President and an internal struggle is going on in the country. This has been put on record by the United Nations observers. Neither the people nor the Parliament of Lebanon have invited the American troops. Moreover, the Speaker of the Parliament has protested against their landing. Consequently, Chamoun's "invitation" does not have constitutional validity.

It has been said that elements who have "infiltrated from outside" have been fighting on the side of the rebels. But the United Nations observers have refuted this cock-and-bull story, and the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld, has openly said so.

After all this, can one insist on the "legality" of the American invasion of Lebanon?

We see the same picture in Jordan. The British Prime Minister, Mr. Macmillan, has said that the British troops were sent there at the request of the King. But British people very well remember that some time ago the people of Jordan, fighting for their freedom, demanded the expulsion from their country of British military personnel, who were compelled

to leave Jordan with ignominy.

It turns out that the bankrupt rulers of Lebanon and Jordan—rulers who have lost the support of their peoples—are trying to retain power with the help of the interventionists. But it is an old truth that rulers whose policy is against the peoples' interests have never felt secure even behind the bayonets of their own armies and have ended in disaster. A ruler's chances of remaining in power by relying on foreign bayonets are even less.

It is also being alleged that the American and British troops have invaded Lebanon and Jordan to protect the lives and property of American and British subjects there. But this is an old trick of the colonialists. It will mislead no one, particularly since everyone knows that no foreigners, including American and British people, were injured or threatened in Lebanon and Jordan.

The aggressors are now playing with fire. It is always easier to start a fire than to put it out. Once it has been lit, however, it is best to put it out at the very beginning, before the flames flare up and spread to neighbouring houses as well. There is only one correct solution in the prevailing conditions—to withdraw the invading forces from the Middle East immediately and to give the peoples of that area the right to decide their destiny for themselves.

At this grim moment in history, when there is not a minute to lose, the Soviet Union, which has always come out for world peace, against war, and for peaceful co-existence, cannot remain indifferent to what is happening in the Middle East, next door to its own frontiers. The Soviet Union cannot keep aloof when the question of war or peace is being decided.

This is why the government of the Soviet Union is proposing an immediate meeting of the heads of government of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain, France and India, with the participation of the United Nations Secretary-General, to take urgent measures to end the military conflict that has begun. We propose that we should meet on any day, and at any hour—the sooner the better. You are perfectly aware that history has left us a small margin in which to avert war, to prevent the annihilation of many millions of people, to prevent the destruction of great material and cultural values.

In its statements the government of the Soviet Union has already set forth with ample clarity its views regarding the peaceful solution of urgent problems of the Middle East, The Soviet Union believes that a solution can and must be found which would meet the vital interests of the peoples of the Middle East and ensure their sovereign rights, with due regard for the interests of all states associated with that area.

The western governments say they are interested in using the oil and other raw material resources of that part of the world. But the peoples of that area are not denying the western powers this opportunity. They demand only one thing: that this problem be solved on an equitable and mutually beneficial commercial basis, which is the most reasonable basis.

The Soviet government believes that a conference of the heads of government of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain, France and India could also consider the question of ending deliveries of arms to the countries of the Middle East, as was earlier proposed by the U.S.S.R.

We also consider it necessary that this summit conference should work out definite recommendations to end the military conflict in the Middle East and should submit them to the Security Council, so that this United Nations body may study them with the participation of representatives from the Arab states.

I think, Mr. Prime Minister, that France's sad and unpleasant experience in Algeria and in the unprovoked British, French and Israeli attack on Egypt has left a sufficiently deep imprint in the heart of every Frenchman to make him understand what grave consequences may arise for the French people from participation in this new military venture. That is why I allow myself to cherish the hope that the French government will give its active support to the calling of a conference of the heads of government of the U.S.S.R., the United States,

Britain, France and India.

The question of the date and place of the meeting cannot be an obstacle to calling it. The Soviet government is prepared to agree to any place, including Washington, if for some reason Geneva or some other capital of a neutral country does not suit the western powers. The main thing is not to wait, not to waste precious time, because the guns are already beginning to speak. We propose that we should meet in Geneva on July 22.

The most reasonable action by our governments in the existing conditions would be to convene a summit conference to settle the military conflict which has broken out in the Middle East. This would be an inestimable contribution to the cause of strengthening peace and international security. This would be an irrefutable proof that the idea of the peaceful, and not military, settlement of questions can and must triumph throughout the world. The peoples of all countries, whatever their colour, religious convictions or political views, would wholeheartedly welcome the ending of aggression in the Middle East.

So, Mr. Prime Minister, it is still not too late to halt the course of events fraught with the danger of a major war. There is still time to find a solution. But this brooks no delay.

On this question I have simultaneously approached the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, the British Prime Minister, Mr. Macmillan, and the Prime Minister of India, Mr. Nehru.

Respectfully yours,

N. KHRUSHCHOV

Moscow. July 19, 1958.

Message to Prime Minister Nehru

DEAR PRIME MINISTER,

I would like to address the following message to you in connection with the situation which has arisen in the Middle East.

American aggression in Lebanon and British aggression in Jordan have led to what is one of the most crucial moments in human history, which has brought us to a brink where any imprudent step may touch off the greatest catastrophe the world has ever seen.

The United States of America and Britain, having launched aggression in Lebanon and Jordan, are claiming that their actions are of a purely local character. But history proves that any local war can easily grow into a world conflagration. In assessing the present acts of aggression by the United States and Britain in the Middle East, we have no right to forget the lessons of history.

The Soviet government considers that at this moment, when an armed conflict has been started, the governments principally responsible for the maintenance of peace must display the greatest degree of coolness and common sense, so as to avoid provoking a worldwide conflagration by their actions. We consider that these governments must look for a solution, not through whipping up bellicose passions and pushing the world towards disaster, but through negotiations and by relying on the dictates of reason and composure, so as to rule out war and ensure peaceful co-existence and world peace.

The armed intervention by the United States of America and Britain against Lebanon and Jordan is a continuation of the old colonialist policy to which your country fell victim at one time. This policy has always brought disaster to those who have sought to carry it out.

In the opinion of the Soviet government, the most reasonable solution would be to have the troops of the United States and Britain withdrawn from Lebanon and Jordan at once and to afford the peoples of those countries an opportunity to decide their destiny for themselves.

The Soviet government considers that

in this grim hour in human history, when the question of war or peace is being decided, it is necessary that the heads of government of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain, France and India, with the participation of the United Nations Secretary-General, should meet without delay to take steps towards ending the armed conflict which has broken out.

The Soviet government proposes a meeting of the heads of government of the abovementioned countries in Geneva or anywhere else on July 22.

In proposing a conference of the heads of government, the Soviet government considers that this conference, after drawing up definite recommendations on ending the conflict in the Middle East, should submit them to the Security Council and that this body would have to consider them with the participation of the Arab countries.

The Soviet government believes that a conference of the heads of government of the great powers for such a noble aim would be a great contribution to international peace and security. This act would be welcomed by the peoples of all countries, whatever their colour, race or creed.

I think you will agree with me if I say that the situation is such that every hour's delay is fraught with grave danger to peace and that all the forces of peace must be mobilised and used to avert the terrible danger that is looming over the world. Inaction and wait-and-see tactics can lead to a catastrophe. We cannot and must not let the forces of aggression and the forces of warlike colonialism imperil world peace and security. We in the Soviet Union know India as one of the largest states, whose voice is heeded, not only in Asia, but throughout the rest of the world as well. The Soviet government hopes that you will do everything you can to contribute to the utmost to the success of the collective efforts of the peaceloving states in order to avert imminent disaster before it is too late.

We do not doubt that India will say her weighty word in defence of the cause for which her courageous people have always fought tirelessly.

By supporting the proposal for an immediate conference and by her own active participation in it, India would be making an inestimable contribution to the cause of preserving peace.

Simultaneously with this letter, we are forwarding corresponding messages to the heads of government of the United States, Britain and France.

Yours sincerely,

N. KHRUSHCHOV

Moscow. July 19, 1958.

N. S. KHRUSHCHOV REPLIES TO HEADS OF GOVERNMENT OF BRITAIN, UNITED STATES, FRANCE AND INDIA

On July 23 N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, sent messages to Prime Minister Macmillan, President Eisenhower, Prime Minister de Gaulle and Prime Minister Nehru in reply to their messages sent in response to his letters of July 19.

Message to Prime Minister Macmillan

MR. PRIME MINISTER,

I have received your reply to my message of July 19. I have also received replies from Mr. Nehru, Mr. Eisenhower and M. de Gaulle to my messages of the same date.

I should not like to enter into polemics at the present time about the reasons for the tension and the threat to peace in the Middle East area. The Soviet government's point of view on these questions has been outlined in my mes-

sage of July 19.

The Soviet government considers that the threat to world peace is at present so serious that it is most urgently necessary to take all possible steps to prevent a world conflict. We cannot minimise the danger of such a conflict, as there are forces which are in favour of extending the zone of aggression in the Middle East and, in the first place, are harbouring plans for an armed attack on Iraq.

It is precisely in order to prevent the outbreak of such a conflict that the Soviet Union has proposed the immediate calling of a meeting of the heads of government of the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, the United States, France and India, with the participation of the United Nations Secretary-General.

We are pleased to note that the Soviet government's proposal concerning a meeting of heads of government has been favourably received by you. It is evident from your message that the government of the United Kingdom is in favour of a meeting of the heads of government for the purpose of discussing, within the framework of the United Nations Security Council, the situation that has now arisen in the Middle East. The Soviet government, in its message of July 19, has already pointed out that the Security Council should not be by-passed. From the replies received from the United States government and from the Prime Minister of France, it follows that they, too, are in favour of such a meeting.

Taking into consideration the need for urgent decisions in the interests of preserving peace, the Soviet government considers that the form in which the meeting of the heads of government takes place cannot be of decisive significance in this particular case. The important thing is that this meeting should be held as soon as possible, so as to find most expeditiously a correct solution which will help to preserve and strengthen peace, will bring tranquillity to the Middle East area, and will promote the relaxation of tension in the relations among states.

We agree with your considerations with regard to the approach to the discussion of this question at a special session of the Security Council with the heads of government taking part. We agree that no resolutions whatsoever should be introduced unless they arise from previous agreement and that the aim of our joint work should be to achieve fruitful agreement and not to record disagreement by means of a vote.

The Soviet government assumes that in order to arrive as quickly as possible at constructive decisions in the interests of preserving and strengthening peace, the heads of government will, as can also be seen from your letter, have the opportunity for joint consultations not only of a formal nature.

Inasmuch as in this case what is involved is a discussion in the Security Council, not of ordinary current questions, but of problems of special importance from the point of view of preserving peace and ensuring security, we consider that in this case it would be useful to invite India, one of the biggest Asian countries and universally recognised as a state which stands for strengthening peace, to take part in the work of the Security Council. Her participation would really be beneficial, in contrast to the participation of one of the so-called permanent members who does not in fact represent anyone. We consider it necessary that the representative of India, in the person of her Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, who has agreed to take part in the meeting of the heads of government—for which we express our gratitude to him—should participate in the work of the Security Council.

We have learned with satisfaction that you, Mr. Prime Minister, are ready to go to New York for a special meeting of the Security Council with the participation of the heads of government. As far as the U.S.S.R. is concerned, taking into account your agreement and the agreement of M. de Gaulle, the Prime Minister of the French Republic, of Mr. Nehru, the Prime Minister of India, and of President Eisenhower of the United States, as is evident from his message of July 22, the Soviet Union will be represented at this meeting by the Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of

Ministers.

Naturally representatives of the interested Arab states should be invited to take part in the discussion of the problems in the Security Council with the participation of the heads of government of the abovementioned five powers.

The Soviet government would like to know as soon as possible the views of the United Kingdom government regarding the date for convening the Security Council with the participation of the heads of government. For our part, we propose that this work in the Security Council should begin in New York on July 28.

Respectfully yours,

N. KHRUSHCHOV

Moscow. July 23, 1958.

THE FACTS ABOUT USSR'S STAND ON SUMMIT MEETING

Tass Commentator Sums Up The Situation

July 30, 1958

THE White House announced on July 28 that there would be no comment on Khrushchov's message, sent to President Eisenhower on that day, until the President had received the text of the document. This is surely quite natural and legitimate. In order to reply to a message, one has first to read it attentively.

But there are some commentators who report, not on what is in the document, but on what is not there.

Associated Press correspondent Scali, for instance, reports from Washington that authoritative officials had told him that Khrushchov evidently rejected Eisenhower's insistent demand that the summit meeting should take place within the framework of the Security Council.

United Press correspondent Bruce Munn also presents matters in a similar light, quoting certain "United Nations diplomats" who had claimed that in his latest message Premier Khrushchov apparently renounced the idea of a summit meeting within the framework of the Security Council.

Thus the commentators are turning the matter upside down and confusing a perfectly clear issue. One has only to turn to the facts to be convinced of this. Here are the facts:

As early as July 19, in view of the dangerous situation, with the question of war or peace in the balance, the Soviet government suggested the immediate calling of a meeting of the heads of government of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain, France and India, with the participation of the United Nations Secretary-General, in order to take immediate steps to end the armed conflict.

Three days later, on July 22, the United States and Britain agreed to a summit meeting within the framework of the Security Council.

This was a positive attitude which opened the road to a meeting of the heads of government. The Soviet Union at once accepted the proposal to hold an urgent, special meeting of the Security Council with the participation of the heads of government, inasmuch as Mr. Macmillan clearly stated that at such a meeting no resolutions not previously agreed upon should be advanced, in order not to reduce the work of the council to the recording of disagreements by a vote instead of reaching agreement.

The correspondence between the heads of government of the western powers and the government of the U.S.S.R. was

published in full both in the U.S.S.R. and in the West, and anyone capable of reading was able to see with perfect clarity what was happening. And this is what happened:

No sooner had the Soviet Union accepted the United States' and Britain's proposal to hold a special meeting of the Security Council with the participation of the heads of government, than President Eisenhower and Prime Minister Macmillan, with remarkable haste, went back on their own positions of July 22 and openly set a course for wrecking the earlier agreement on the speediest holding of the five-power summit meeting. Instead, they suggested that the question of the Middle East situation be referred to a regular meeting of the Security Council at which, relying on their sheer majority of votes, they have already prevented any positive decisions from being taken to end the present armed conflict.

This conformed to the pronouncements of many farsighted western commentators who had forecast that the positive attitude taken by the United States and Britain on July 22 was only a manœuvre undertaken on the expectation that the Soviet Union would reject the proposal for a summit meeting within the framework of the Security Council. Indeed, when the Soviet Union accepted this proposal, the United States and Britain made an about-turn, thus demonstrating their actual opposition to a meeting of the heads of government, their actual opposition to steps aimed at quenching the fire which has broken out in the Middle East.

Such are the facts, and when "one responsible western diplomat," as reported by Harrelson of the *Associated Press*, says that the U.S.S.R., by its latest message of July 28, has slammed the door, this is obviously the biggest of all the distortions of the U.S.S.R.'s position ever disseminated in the West.

Such "responsible western diplomats" should be advised to do one thing: to read what is plainly written in black and white in Khrushchov's message of July 28. This is what it says:

> **"In view of the extremely tense situation which has arisen in the area of the Near and Middle East, the Soviet government, as before, considers that a meeting of the heads of government of the U.S.S.R., the United States, the United Kingdom, France and India, with the participation of the United Nations Secretary-General, should be called at once."**

The head of the French government would prefer this meeting to take place in Europe. The U.S.S.R. government supports this proposal. While still not objecting to a meeting in New York, it is ready to meet in Geneva, Vienna, Paris, or at any place acceptable to all the participants.

One thing is clear: Time does not wait. It is necessary to act. It is not fresh manœuvres and prevarications that the world now expects from the governments of the United States and Britain, but a clear reply to the question: When are they prepared to take part in a meeting of the heads of government?

TASS STATEMENT ON MEETING OF COUNCIL OF BAGHDAD PACT

July 30, 1958

ON July 28 and 29 a meeting of the council of the so-called Baghdad Pact took place in London. The meeting was attended by the Prime Ministers of Britain, Turkey, Iran and Pakistan, and also by the Secretary of State of the U.S.A., Mr. Dulles. On this occasion the representative of Iraq was not present. Iraq's membership of the pact had been conceived by the western powers as a

means of securing the participation of other Arab states in the military and political measures of the United States and Britain in the Middle East. The revolutionary *coup* in Iraq swept away the mercenary Nuri es-Said clique who had drawn Iraq into the Baghdad Pact, and the young Republic of Iraq, which has thrown off the fetters of colonialism, has embarked on the road of independent development.

In an effort to save this aggressive bloc, which was falling to pieces, the United States had to discard its mask and proclaim its readiness to undertake to the full the commitments arising from this pact. As is well known, the United States has already been directly participating for a long time in the principal bodies of this organisation, has been the major supplier of armaments to the Baghdad Pact countries and has borne the overwhelming share of the expenditure involved in carrying out military preparations within the framework of this pact.

The United States has long since relegated to the background Britain, who at one time hoped that by creating the Baghdad Pact she would be able to reinforce her colonial positions in the Middle East. Now it is the United States which is in fact the leader of the Baghdad Pact and directs all its activities. Consequently, whereas previously the United States pulled the strings from behind the scenes, now it has come out into the open as the boss of the aggressive bloc intended to serve the interests of the colonialists.

The meeting adopted a special declaration signed by all those taking part, including the "observer," Mr. Dulles, and also a short communiqué. Nearly every line of the declaration emphasises that the participants in the conference are concerned only with "strengthening their defences," maintaining their "collective security," "resisting aggression," etc. These words about security and defence have a particularly hollow ring now that all the world has witnessed the armed intervention of the United States and Britain in Lebanon and Jordan. In the communiqué those taking part in the meeting unscrupulously approved the aggression of the United States and Britain against Lebanon and Jordan and made it plain that they were ready to extend aggression in the Middle East.

In order to justify armed intervention and interference in the domestic affairs of the countries of the Arab world, the participants in the London meeting describe the struggle of the peoples of Iraq, Lebanon and Jordan for their national independence as "indirect aggression," although in reality it is solely a case of direct aggression by the United States and Britain.

On examining the declaration and the communiqué, an involuntary question arises: From whom, after all, do the members of the Baghdad Pact intend to defend themselves and who is threatening their security and independence? What is actually being hidden behind this display of concern for "collective security"? Is it not a fact that even the Americans themselves admit that the Arab armies cannot constitute a threat to the members of the Pact?

Why, then, did the representatives of the United States, Britain, Turkey, Iran and Pakistan gather in London? The facts make it plain beyond a shred of doubt that the London conference was in fact nothing but a conclave of plotters planning fresh acts of aggression against the Arab countries which have recently embarked on the road of independent development, and in the first place against the United Arab Republic and the Republic of Iraq. The United States and Britain, having carried out armed intervention in Lebanon and Jordan, are now, jointly with their Baghdad Pact accomplices, preparing to extend aggression. There is a continuous build up of American armed forces in Lebanon. According to press reports, every five minutes American transport planes are landing on the Halde airfield; arms, ammunition and equipment dumps are being established on Lebanese territory. More than 70 ships of the United States Sixth Fleet are cruising off the Lebanese coast. These ships carry hundreds of

military aircraft ready to go into action at a moment's notice.

More than 150 American military aircraft, including the latest F-100 Super-Sabre jet fighters and B-57 bombers are concentrated in Turkey in the Adana area, within a few minutes' flying time from the Syrian frontiers. American troops and military material are also continually arriving there. Turkish troops stationed in Iskanderun are being urgently brought up to the frontiers of the Syrian region of the United Arab Republic. There is also a concentration of Turkish troops on the frontiers of Iraq. At the same time Turkey is calling up reservists. Leading Turkish statesmen do not even find it necessary to make a secret of the fact that all these measures are being taken in preparation for attacking the Republic of Iraq and the United Arab Republic. In particular, this was announced openly a few days ago by the Turkish Foreign Minister, Mr. Zorlu.

Starting from July 16, large consignments of "special purpose" goods and numerous groups of American "tourists," who are reported to be servicemen in civilian clothes, have been rushed to Iran from the N.A.T.O. military bases in Western Germany. All these "tourists" are being immediately sent to the towns of Dizful, Kermanshah and other points near the Iranian-Iraqi frontier. Iran is also calling up reservists and moving large military formations.

British forces are being concentrated in the area of the Persian Gulf to the south of Iraq. Thus, the 24th Infantry Brigade has arrived in the Bahrein islands from Kenya. British troops have landed in the principalities of Lahej, Kuwait and Oman. The number of British paratroops in Jordan is steadily growing, and has now reached more than 5,000 officers and men. On orders from his foreign patrons, King Hussein of Jordan is rattling the sabre and openly declaring that with the help of the forces of intervention he is ready to march on Iraq.

Although formally not a member of the Baghdad Pact, Israel is openly supporting the aggressive actions of the western powers by allowing the transit of British and American troops and supplies over her territory and by taking mobilisation measures.

It becomes clear in the light of these facts what a grave danger is threatening the peoples of the Middle East, and whose interests are being served by Asian countries which are members of this aggressive bloc. But the governments of these countries in particular would do well to draw some conclusions from the recent events in Iraq. It is common knowledge that the attempts of Nuri es-Said to use Iraqi troops for the suppression of the popular movement in another Arab state ended very sadly, not only for Nuri es-Said himself, but also for the entire old and rotten régime in Iraq. Only people who have lost the ability to make a sober assessment of the situation that is now developing in the Middle East, and who do not want to take the spirit of the epoch into account, can embark on the road of military ventures and open struggle against the national liberation movement.

Only yesterday the self-same representatives of the Baghdad Pact were praising Iraq when the country was headed by mercenary agents of colonialism. They tried to use Iraq as a bait to lure the other Arab states into this bloc. Now that the Iraqi people have taken their destiny into their own hands, the members of the Baghdad Pact, including the ruling circles of the Moslem countries which are parties to the pact, are sharpening their knives in order to stab the Republic of Iraq, simply because its people no longer want to bear the yoke of colonial slavery and have bravely set out on the road of strengthening their national independence. What, then, is the value of the various hypocritical statements which the western leaders like to make about human rights and freedoms, about respect for political and religious convictions?

It goes without saying that if the freedom-loving people of Iraq, who are upholding their just cause, fall victim to aggression prepared by the members of the Baghdad Pact, the peaceloving

peoples will come to their aid.

At a time when the Soviet Union and the other peaceloving countries are making every effort to convene a summit conference to take urgent steps ensuring a peaceful solution to the crisis in the Middle East, the parties to the London meeting, as it is now obvious to everyone, are preparing new aggressive steps aimed at further aggravating the military conflict. In view of this, it becomes even clearer why the tactics of subterfuges and delay are now being resorted to by the governments of the United States and Britain, which are trying to avoid the immediate calling of a summit conference, in defiance of the persistent demands of the peoples.

In connection with what has been stated above, we cannot but draw the attention of the member-countries of the Baghdad Pact to the fact that the entire responsibility for the further unleashing of aggression and for the attendant consequences rests with the governments of the United States and Britain and also with the government circles of those members of the Baghdad Pact who are following in the wake of the policy of the imperialist powers.

N. S. Khrushchov Replies to Messages of Mr. Macmillan, Mr. Eisenhower and General de Gaulle

On August 5 N. S. Khrushchov, Chairman of the U.S.S.R. Council of Ministers, sent the following messages to Prime Minister Macmillan, President Eisenhower and Prime Minister de Gaulle in reply to their recent messages:

MESSAGE TO

PRIME MINISTER MACMILLAN

MR. PRIME MINISTER,

I received on July 31 your reply to my message of July 28 concerning the situation now prevailing in the Middle East.

In the earlier messages of the Soviet government we have shown, with facts in hand, that it has been precisely the armed intervention of the United States and the United Kingdom in Lebanon and Jordan that has created an atmosphere dangerous to the cause of peace in the Middle East. Therefore the claim you make in your message about the allegedly groundless nature of the Soviet government's assessment of the actions of the United Kingdom and United States governments is in complete contradiction with the real state of affairs.

In your message of July 31, Mr. Prime Minister, you contend that as regards the problem of a meeting of heads of government to discuss the situation that has arisen in the Middle East, your position set forth in your message of July 22 has not altered and that you have never gone back on this position. However, we cannot agree with this, because the proposal which you made in your message of July 26, and which you are making now, signifies the rejection of a meeting of the heads of government, which was supported earlier by the government of the United Kingdom.

You now suggest that a meeting of the Security Council, and not a meeting of heads of government, be called for

the aforementioned purposes. The whole world knows, however, that the Security Council, which has been discussing the situation in Lebanon and Jordan for a long time, has so far failed to take effective steps to solve this problem.

The desire of the governments of the United States and the United Kingdom to direct the examination of the problem of the situation in the Middle East precisely into this channel of barren discussions is particularly apparent from Mr. Eisenhower's message of August 1, which I have received and in which the United States President already speaks in quite unambiguous terms about having this question discussed at an ordinary meeting of the Security Council.

While you mention the possibility of organising "less formal" meetings of the heads of government, it is evident from this message of Mr. Eisenhower that the United States government rejects the very idea of the possibility of a meeting of heads of government outside the procedure for the ordinary meetings of the Security Council, although it is well known that as matters stand in the Security Council at the present time, when most of its members are states which belong to aggressive blocs and when the great Chinese People's Republic is not represented in it, this body cannot draw impartial conclusions with regard to the armed foreign intervention in countries of the Arab world.

From the first days of the intervention by the United States and the United Kingdom in the Middle East, the Soviet Union has been advocating urgent measures for cutting short the aggression, withdrawing foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan, preventing the extension of the intervention and eliminating the dangerous tension created by the actions of the United Kingdom and the United States. For these purposes the Soviet government suggested that a conference be held of the heads of government of five powers —the U.S.S.R., the United Kingdom, the United States, France and India—with the participation of the United Nations Secretary-General. We regret that you yourself and the United States President have not found it possible to accept this proposal and are continuing to insist on having the Middle East situation discussed, as previously, in the Security Council—a body which is incapable of solving it in an impartial way. Thus the question of holding a meeting of the heads of government of five powers, with the participation of the United Nations Secretary-General, has not been solved in a positive manner.

Although the governments of the United Kingdom and the United States have made the five-power meeting impossible and are directly responsible for this, it can be pointed out quite definitely at the present time that the demands of the peoples for the immediate convening of such a meeting in order to end the armed intervention in Jordan and Lebanon, and the determination of peaceloving states to put an end to aggression in the Middle East have compelled the initiators of the armed intervention to renounce, for the time being, the plans for extending aggression to other countries, and in the first place to the Republic of Iraq and the United Arab Republic. It is not by chance, therefore, that western powers, including the United Kingdom and the United States, have had to recognise the Republic of Iraq, the emergence of which was at first presented by the aggressors as being a threat to peace in the Middle East. This does not mean, however, that the danger of the conflict in this area being extended and exacerbated has been removed or that the security of the Republic of Iraq and other Arab states has been ensured. The interventionist troops have not yet been withdrawn from Jordan and Lebanon. Moreover, fresh contingents of foreign troops are arriving in this area and new military measures are being taken in the Baghdad Pact countries.

The problem of completely stopping the armed intervention in the Middle East and of providing conditions there for relieving the people of that area of foreign interference, must be solved most urgently. Foreign troops must be withdrawn from Lebanon and Jordan at once, because their presence there is

a constant threat to peace and the independence of peoples and a flagrant breach of the United Nations Charter which cannot be tolerated by any member-state of the United Nations.

In these conditions the Soviet government feels itself bound to continue efforts to safeguard and consolidate peace in the Middle East. Since the governments of the United States and the United Kingdom have evaded the convocation of a five-power meeting of heads of government, and the Security Council, as we have previously pointed out, has failed to ensure a solution to the problem of the situation in the Middle East in the interests of peace, the government of the Soviet Union, in order to ensure the speediest measures necessary to end the aggression, has instructed its representative in the United Nations to demand the convocation of an emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly to discuss the problem of the withdrawal of the troops of the United Kingdom from Jordan and of the United States troops from Lebanon. The Soviet government hopes that the discussion of this question in the General Assembly, in which both large states and small ones are represented, will make it possible to find ways to eliminate the war danger that has been created in the Middle East by the actions of the United Kingdom and the United States, and to bring tranquillity to that area.

Mr. Prime Minister, I believe you will agree that the events in the Middle East which have confronted the world with the danger of a general war—with the incalculable suffering that would entail for the peoples—lend special urgency to the question of providing conditions for the peaceful co-existence of states and ending the "cold war," which is poisoning the entire international atmosphere. The Soviet Union and all peaceloving countries are doing everything possible to create conditions in which no great power will be able to commit aggression, even against a small country. Precisely for this reason, the great powers must agree not to take steps which would place mankind on the brink of military catastrophes.

We think it necessary to promote in every way contacts and ties between statesmen of all countries. Personal meetings between leaders of states might reduce the existing tension and help to create confidence and mutual understanding among states and to melt the ice of the "cold war" more quickly. The Soviet government attaches particularly great importance to such contacts and, as you know, as early as last December suggested a top level meeting of statesmen. We are convinced that a summit meeting in the composition we suggested earlier would, given the efforts of all participants, help to find ways and means to put an end to the state of "cold war" and make it impossible for a shooting war to break out. Let us do everything possible in order to ensure that such a meeting, which all the peoples are awaiting, is not endlessly delayed. We are awaiting your agreement to our proposal for a top level conference, and are prepared to take part in it at any time. It is in the interests of all states, large and small, for a summit meeting to be called as soon as possible.

In conclusion, I should like to express the hope that the government of the United Kingdom will support the proposal for convening an emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly, which could be a useful step towards reducing tension and preparing the ground for an early summit meeting.

Respectfully yours,

N. KHRUSHCHOV

Moscow. August 5, 1958.

MESSAGE TO PRESIDENT EISENHOWER

MR. PRESIDENT,

I have received your message of August 1. I fully agree with remarks in it about the significance of personal correspondence between heads of government. In the present conditions personal correspondence must serve the basic aim which the peoples set themselves—the aim of safeguarding peace and peaceful co-existence among the states, regardless of their social systems.

I also agree with you that an unusual correspondence is now taking place between us. Please understand me correctly —this unusual correspondence has been a result of the unusual steps taken by the United States and Britain in the Middle East. The United States and Britain have violated peace in that area by invading Lebanon and Jordan with their troops.

In your message you speak of the need to resort to the help of the United Nations and the Security Council in connection with the situation existing in the Middle East. You correctly point out that the United Nations was created out of the travail of World War II. It is common knowledge that mankind has linked its hopes for the preservation of peace with the work of the United Nations and its Security Council, which is entrusted with the main responsibility for safeguarding world peace.

Indeed, proceeding from the recognition of this role of the United Nations, the Soviet government, at the very beginning of the American and British aggression against the Arab states, submitted in the Security Council a proposal that the interventionist troops be withdrawn from Lebanon and Jordan and that an emergency session of the General Assembly be called on this question.

However, the United States, Britain and certain other states now on the Security Council, prevented it from taking a decision normalising the situation in the Middle East. Frankly speaking, it should be admitted that it is precisely the policy pursued by the United States and supported by Britain and, unfortunately, by some other states as well, that undermines this international organisation and deprives the Security Council of the opportunity to fulfil its functions. We do not have to go far for examples. Didn't the United States order its troops to invade Lebanon in circumvention of the Security Council? Would you deny that having landed its troops there, the United States government confronted the Security Council with a *fait accompli*? Can it be said that such actions strengthen the United Nations and the Security Council? If we glance at the composition of the Security Council as it now stands, we are bound to draw the conclusion that, under pressure from the United States, this body has actually become a kind of a committee dominated by member-countries of N.A.T.O., the Baghdad Pact and S.E.A.T.O., a committee in which the lawful seat of the representative of the great Chinese People's Republic is held by a representative of a political corpse—Chiang Kai-shek.

The policy of ignoring People's China is sheer madness. This great power exists and is growing stronger and developing, regardless of whether or not it is recognised by certain governments. If reason were to prevail and the Chinese People's Republic were to take its legitimate place in the United Nations, this would be properly assessed by all the peoples, because they realise that without the Chinese People's Republic, the Security Council and the United Nations cannot be completely effective bodies in safeguarding peace and ensuring security as laid down in the Charter of this organisation.

A situation has thus arisen in which the Security Council has in fact been paralysed and is unable to take, against the will of the United States, any decision which would effectively promote the safeguarding of world peace.

I do not want to engage in polemics with you at the present time. Nevertheless, I cannot ignore the assertions made in your letter which distort the foreign policy of the Soviet Union and its aims.

You allege, for instance, that the Soviet Union has foisted its political domination on East European states. We are, of course, far from being surprised by this statement, which is, however, absolutely without grounds. We have heard it so many times from U.S. State Secretary Dulles. But frequent repetition does not make such assertions any more convincing. The peoples of Eastern Europe have freely chosen their present way of life and they will not allow anyone to change it. You have repeatedly made statements about your support for small nations. To be consistent, you must actually recognise the right of peoples to take independent decisions and to establish political régimes in keeping with their own interests. However, in practice there is nothing of the kind. As soon as any changes occur which upset the state of affairs that suits the United States government, you present those changes as something brought about, not by the will of the peoples, but by some alien will.

Can we close our eyes, however, to the fact that we are living in an epoch of great revolutionary upheavals, in an epoch when the social system is being reshaped on new lines. This surge, started in the Soviet Union, is now assuming ever greater scope. It has spread to China, countries of Eastern Europe, North Korea and North Viet Nam. At the same time peoples of many African and Asian countries who were ruthlessly oppressed by the imperialist powers, have gained their national independence in the struggle against internal and foreign oppressors. The peoples of a number of other countries on those continents are waging a national liberation struggle and will undoubtedly achieve victory, because no foreign bayonets of the colonialists can prevent this in the death hour of colonialism. This is the implacable course of history; this is the will of the peoples.

No country, if it really wants to show concern for the independence and security of small states, can assume the right to interfere in the affairs of those countries and to proclaim various "doctrines" with this end in view. But on what grounds, then, did the United States government proclaim the doctrine which bears your name, and by what right is it interfering in the affairs of the Middle East countries?

When, for instance, the people of Lebanon, disgusted at the policy of their President, who has become a servant of the United States and not of his own people, demanded his removal, it was enough for the President, who had lost the confidence of his people, to appeal to you in violation of his country's constitution, and the United States government moved its Sixth Fleet, dispatched its marines to Lebanon and began establishing "law and order" there in accordance with the abovementioned doctrine. The British government headed by Mr. Macmillan used the appeal addressed to it by the Jordanian King, who does not enjoy any support inside his own country, as a pretext for beginning armed interference in Jordan's internal affairs.

Some people in the United States still boast that government of that country interfered in Guatemalan affairs and exiled the lawfully elected government and President. Does this also correspond to your understanding of concern for small countries and respect for their independence and dignity?

Since this is so, Mr. President, we have, then, different conceptions of the rights of small peoples. In generally accepted political language these actions by the United States government signify a violation of the rights of small nations and the foisting of its *diktat* on them. This is what all the countries whose independence the United States and Britain encroach upon, are fighting against.

If we were to recall other instances of this kind, even without going far into the past—the latest landing of American troops in Cuba, for instance—we would have to say a great deal on this subject and this message would undoubtedly grow too long.

I cannot fail to touch upon your assessment of the events in the Middle East. You assert that the Middle East problem is not a problem of United States aggression, but rather a problem of indirect aggression. Thus, in speaking about some indirect aggression, you, Mr.

President, obviously regard—as we and the majority of other countries do—the dispatch of foreign troops to the territories of other countries as being an act of direct aggression. There can be no objection to this. That is why the landing of American troops in Lebanon and the sending of British troops to Jordan is rightly regarded throughout the world as direct aggression. As for the hints contained in your message regarding some kind of indirect aggression, reference to this alleged danger cannot be regarded as other than an attempt to cover up the direct aggression committed by the United States.

Incidentally, assertions about the indirect aggression allegedly threatening Lebanon have been refuted by the two well-known reports of the United Nations observers specially sent by the Security Council to Lebanon.

In these circumstances we do not understand, Mr. President, by what right the United States government is assuming the role of arbiter and judge in asserting that some sort of indirect aggression had taken place in Lebanon? It is obviously because you do not recognise the right of the peoples of the Middle East to take care of their own future and arrange matters in their countries on lines which are in keeping with the interests of those nations. Here, Mr. President, you are in direct conflict with your own statements about respect for the desires, dignity and security of the small nations.

The whole world knows that the internal events in Lebanon, Iraq and Jordan are an expression of the anger of their peoples, who rose up against the system imposed upon them by the imperialist colonialists. People who could no longer endure the oppression and outrages of the lackeys of foreign states rebelled in Iraq. Now the United States and other western powers have recognised the republican government of Iraq. Consequently you and your allies, Mr. President, have recognised that the people of Iraq had the right to change their former way of life. Your assertions about some indirect aggression are thus absolutely without grounds; they divert attention from the real aggression which is taking place in the Middle East and which is being committed by the United States and Britain.

We regret, Mr. President, that you do not agree to a summit conference in Moscow, ostensibly because there has been an angry demonstration of Muscovites outside the United States Embassy in protest against American armed intervention in Lebanon. That demonstration was an entirely natural manifestation of the Soviet people's sympathy for a victim of aggression. Your reference to this circumstance is even more unconvincing, because the United States government itself still refuses to take measures ensuring normal conditions for the work of the Soviet representation at the United Nations, and has not put a stop to the systematic provocative actions by certain elements in New York against the U.S.S.R. representation, which, of course, could not fail to influence the sentiments of the Soviet people who attended the demonstration.

It was not our people, Mr. President, who started such demonstrations. It would be a good thing if such actions were curbed in the United States. Our people would duly appreciate that.

I should like to point out that our people have a correct understanding of events and make a proper distinction between the actions of hired hooligans against the Soviet representation in New York and the true feelings of the American people. We entertain the friendliest feelings for the people of the United States and are striving to develop broad cultural and economic relations between our two countries. We want our peoples to know each other better and exert joint efforts to safeguard and strengthen peace, to end the estrangement between our countries, to make all countries live in accordance with the principle of genuine good neighbourliness. The Soviet people's attitude to the people of the United States is generally known. It could be recalled that at a time when irresponsible elements—hired with funds allotted for subversive activity against countries which are not members of the aggressive blocs dominated by the United

States—were raging at the building of the Soviet representation in New York, American scientists, specialists, sportsmen, tourists, and also the prominent American public leader, Mr. Adlai Stevenson, were being received by the Soviet people with their usual cordiality and warmth.

I now wish to return to the crux of the matter, to what should be, in this particular case, the main subject of our present correspondence—the question of how to take speedy and effective steps to end the military intervention of the United States and Britain in the Middle East.

You believe that the examination of this question should be entrusted to the United Nations Security Council. Unfortunately, as I have already pointed out above, the situation in which the Security Council is now placed—a situation in which it is practically subjected to United States foreign policy, and the majority of representatives of various countries sitting on it are unable to do anything that is in contradiction with the United States attitude—does not allow us to regard your proposal as correct. The policy of the United States with regard to the Security Council lessens the Council's ability to take effective steps to defend peace and to curb aggression. It does away with the effectiveness of the Security Council as an instrument of peace.

The United Nations and its Security Council are useful international bodies and they must express the peaceloving aspirations of the peoples. However, the government of the United States is using the Security Council in its own selfish interests through the representatives of countries which are members of military blocs dominated by the U.S.A. The United States is actually striving to reduce the Security Council to the status of an auxiliary organ of the U.S. State Department. How can we close our eyes to the real situation and ignore the fact that the Security Council, composed as it is at present, is unable to draw unbiased conclusions on the situation in the Middle East?

No, Mr. President, the interests of safeguarding world peace and strengthening security call for a sensible approach on our part, making it possible to take a positive decision ensuring peace. From the very first days of American and British intervention in the Middle East, the Soviet Union has been advocating immediate measures for cutting short this aggression, withdrawing foreign troops from Lebanon and Jordan, preventing the extension of the intervention and eliminating the dangerous tension created by the actions of the United States and Britain. With this end in view, we proposed a summit meeting of five powers—the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain, France and India—with the participation of the United Nations Secretary-General, Mr. Hammarskjöld. We regret that you yourself and Mr. Macmillan have not considered it possible to accept this proposal of ours, thus preventing a positive solution to the question of calling a five-power summit conference with the participation of the United Nations Secretary-General.

Although the governments of the United States and Britain have made the five-power meeting impossible and are directly responsible for this, it can be pointed out quite definitely at the present time that the demands of the peoples for such a meeting to end the armed intervention in Lebanon and Jordan, and the determination of the peaceloving states to put an end to aggression in the Middle East, have compelled the initiators of this armed intervention to refrain, at this stage, from extending the aggression to other countries, and above all to the Republic of Iraq and the United Arab Republic. It is not without reason, therefore, that the western powers, including the United States and Britain, have had to recognise the Republic of Iraq, the emergence of which was at first presented by the aggressors as being a threat to peace in the Middle East. This does not mean, however, that the danger of the conflict in this area being exacerbated and extended has been removed or that the security of the Republic of Iraq and the other Arab states has been ensured. The interventionist troops have not yet been withdrawn from Lebanon and Jordan.

Moreover, fresh contingents of foreign troops are being poured into this area and new military measures are being taken in the Baghdad Pact countries.

The problem of completely stopping the armed intervention in the Middle East and of providing conditions there for relieving the peoples of that area of foreign interference, is still awaiting an early solution. Foreign troops must be withdrawn from Lebanon and Jordan at once, because their presence there is a constant threat to peace and the independence of peoples and a flagrant breach of the United Nations Charter which cannot be tolerated by any member-state of the United Nations.

In these conditions the Soviet government believes it to be necessary to continue to exert efforts to safeguard and consolidate peace in the Middle East. Since the governments of the United States and Britain have declined a five-power summit conference, and the Security Council, as has already been pointed out, has proved to be unable to ensure a solution to the problem of the situation in the Middle East in the interests of peace, the government of the Soviet Union, in order to ensure the speediest measures necessary to end the aggression, has instructed its representative in the United Nations to demand the convocation of an emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly to discuss the problem of the withdrawal of the troops of the United States from Lebanon and of the British forces from Jordan. The Soviet government hopes that the discussion of this question in the General Assembly, in which both large states and small ones are represented, will make it possible to find ways to eliminate the war danger that has been created in the Middle East by the actions of the United States and Britain, and to bring tranquillity to that area.

Mr. President, I believe you will agree with me that in view of the events in the Middle East which have confronted the world with the danger of a general war —with all the incalculable suffering that would entail for the peoples—the question of creating conditions for the peaceful co-existence of states and ending the "cold war," which is poisoning the entire international atmosphere, has become particularly pressing. The Soviet Union and all peaceloving countries are working to bring about a situation in which no great power will be able to unleash aggression, even against a small country. Aggression by a small country against a big country is entirely unthinkable. A small country does not possess the divisions of which you, Mr. President, speak in your message. We must take into account the actual conditions and possibilities. A world war can be unleashed, not by a small country, but by a great power possessing many divisions and many atomic and hydrogen weapons—a power having many rockets, bombers and other means of annihilation. That is why it is precisely the great powers which must agree not to take steps placing the world on the brink of military catastrophes.

The Soviet government believes that contacts between the government leaders of all countries should be developed in every way. Personal meetings between government leaders can reduce international tension and help to create confidence and understanding between states and to melt the ice of the "cold war." We attach particularly great importance to such contacts and, as you know, as early as last December suggested a summit conference of government leaders. We are convinced that, given the efforts of all parties, a top level conference in the composition we suggested earlier can help to find ways and means to put an end to the state of "cold war" and make it impossible for a shooting war to break out.

Let us do everything possible in order to ensure that this meeting, which all the peoples are waiting, is not endlessly delayed. We are awaiting your agreement to our proposal for a summit meeting and are ready to take part in it at any time. The speedy convocation of a summit conference is in the interests of all states, both large and small.

In conclusion I should like to express the hope that the United States government will support the proposal for con-

vening an emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly, which could be a useful step towards reducing tension and preparing the ground for an early summit meeting.

Respectfully yours,

N. KHRUSHCHOV

Moscow. August 5, 1958.

MESSAGE TO

PRIME MINISTER DE GAULLE

MR. PRIME MINISTER,

In your message in reply to my message to you of July 28, you announce that the French government reaffirms its acceptance of the Soviet government's proposal for a meeting of heads of government to consider the situation in the Middle East.

We must point out that neither the President of the United States, Mr. Eisenhower, nor the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan, agree to a five-power meeting of heads of government being held to consider this question and they suggest that a meeting of the Security Council be held.

Thus we are now confronted with an absence of agreement among the great powers regarding a meeting of heads of government. As for the Security Council, in its present state, which is the result of the policy of the United States, supported by Britain and certain other countries, it has demonstrated its inability to cope with the task of ending armed aggression in the Middle East.

From the very beginning of aggression by the United States against Lebanon and by Britain against Jordan, the Soviet Union condemned it, issued a warning concerning the threat of intervention to Iraq and other states of the Arab world, and suggested the immediate convening of a meeting of the heads of government of the U.S.S.R., France, the United States, Britain and India, with the participation of the United Nations Secretary-General, in order to take urgent measures to put an end to the dangerous situation which had arisen in the Middle East.

Although the governments of the United States and Britain have made the convocation of a five-power meeting impossible, it can be pointed out quite definitely at the present time that the demands of the peoples for the immediate convening of such a meeting in order to stop the armed intervention in Lebanon and Jordan, and the determination of peaceloving states to put an end to aggression in the Middle East have compelled the initiators of the armed intervention to refrain, for the time being, from extending aggression to other countries, and in the first place to the Republic of Iraq and the United Arab Republic.

It is not by chance, therefore, that the western powers, including the United States and Britain, have had to recognise the Republic of Iraq, the emergence of which was at first presented by the aggressors as being a threat to peace in the Middle East. This does not mean, however, that the danger of the conflict in this area being extended and exacerbated has been removed or that the security of Iraq and other Arab states has been ensured. The troops of the aggressors, as is well known, have not yet been withdrawn either from Lebanon or from Jordan. Moreover both the United States and Britain are continuing the build-up of their armed forces in that area and new military measures are being taken in the Baghdad Pact countries.

As hitherto, the question of putting a complete end to armed intervention in the Middle East and of providing conditions there to relieve the peoples of that area of foreign interference demands a most urgent solution. Foreign troops must be withdrawn from Lebanon and Jordan at once, because their presence there is a constant threat to peace and the independence of peoples and a flagrant breach of the United Nations Charter which cannot be tole-

rated by any member-state of the United Nations. The Soviet Union, therefore, resolutely insists on the immediate withdrawal of these troops from the aforementioned countries. This demand is supported by all the peaceloving nations.

A situation has arisen in which the Security Council, as experience has shown, and as you yourself are aware, has proved incapable of solving the problem of ending the armed conflict in the Middle East; as for a meeting of the heads of government to settle this problem, we have been unable to reach agreement in view of the negative attitude adopted by the United States and Britain. What way out can be found in this situation? The Soviet Union considers it necessary to call an emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly in order to examine and settle the question of the immediate withdrawal of American forces from Lebanon and of British forces from Jordan. In view of this, the Soviet government has instructed its permanent representative in the United Nations to demand the convocation of an emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly to consider this problem.

The Soviet government hopes that the discussion of this question in the General Assembly, in which both large states and small ones are represented, will make it possible to find ways to eliminate the war danger that has been created in the Middle East by the actions of the United States and Britain, and to bring tranquillity to that area.

Mr. Prime Minister, I believe you will agree that the events in the Middle East which confront the world with the threat of a general war—with the incalculable suffering that would entail for the peoples—lend special urgency to the question of providing conditions for the peaceful co-existence of states and ending the "cold war," which is poisoning the entire international atmosphere. The Soviet Union and all peaceloving countries are doing everything possible to create conditions in which no great power will be able to commit aggression, even against a small country. Precisely for this reason, the great powers must agree not to take steps which would place mankind on the brink of military catastrophes.

The Soviet government believes that it is necessary to promote in every way contacts between statesmen of all countries. Personal meetings between leaders of states can reduce the existing tension and help to create confidence and understanding among states and to melt the ice of the "cold war" more quickly. We attach particularly great importance to such contacts and, as you know, as early as last December suggested the convocation of a top level conference of statesmen. We are convinced that, given the efforts of all parties, a top level meeting in the composition we suggested earlier would make it possible to find ways and means to put an end to the state of "cold war" and make it impossible for a shooting war to break out.

Let us do everything possible in order to ensure that such a meeting, which all the peoples are awaiting, is not endlessly delayed. We are awaiting your agreement to our proposal for a summit meeting and are ready to take part in such a meeting at any time. The speediest convocation of a summit conference is in the interests of all states, both large and small.

In conclusion I should like to express the hope that the government of France will support the proposal for convening an emergency session of the United Nations General Assembly, which could be a useful step towards reducing tension and preparing the ground for an early summit meeting.

Respectfully yours,

N. KHRUSHCHOV

Moscow. August 5, 1958.

APPENDIX

Draft of 'Basic Principles for a Declaration by the Governments of the USSR, the United States, Britain and France on Peace and Security in the Middle East and Non-Interference in the Domestic Affairs of the Countries of that Area'

On 11th February, 1957, the Soviet Government sent a Note to the Governments of Britain, the United States and France containing the following document.

THE governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Republic of France,

GUIDED by the high peaceful aims and principles of the United Nations Organisation, set forth in its Charter,

DECLARE their agreement that their policies with regard to the Middle East countries are based on the desire to establish peace and security in the Middle East and throughout the world;

RECOGNISE AND RESPECT the high principles of relations among states set forth at the Bandung Conference of Asian and African countries;

STRIVE to create favourable conditions for the strengthening of the national independence and sovereignty of the Middle East countries;

EXPRESS their sincere desire to promote, through joint and disinterested efforts, the economic progress of the countries of that area, proceeding all the time from the premise that the natural resources of the underdeveloped countries are the inalienable national property of their peoples, who have the full right to dispose of them and use them at their own discretion, in the interests of developing their national economies and promoting their progress.

The governments of the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain and France

WISH to assist in the all-round development of economic, trade and cultural contacts between the Middle East countries and all other countries, on the basis of equality and mutual benefit.

CONSIDER that broad economic and commercial relations with the countries of this area are in the interests not only of these countries themselves, but are also in the interests of ensuring the economic prosperity of the other countries of the world.

RECOGNISE the need to settle peacefully by means of negotiations all international problems and disputes related to the Middle East.

AWARE of the responsibility which they bear for the maintenance of peace and security throughout the world, the governments of the U.S.S.R., the United States, Britain and France pledge that they will abide by the following principles in their policy with regard to the Middle East:

1. The preservation of peace in the Middle East through the settlement of all issues by peaceful means alone, and by means of negotiations.

2. Non-interference in the domestic affairs of the Middle East countries; respect for their sovereignty and independence.

3. The renunciation of all attempts to involve these countries in military blocs in which great powers participate.

4. The liquidation of foreign bases and the withdrawal of foreign troops from the territories of the Middle East countries.

5. Reciprocal refusal to deliver arms to the Middle East countries.

6. The promotion of the economic development of the Middle East countries without the attachment of political, military or other terms to this incompatible with the dignity and sovereignty of these states.

The governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United States of America, the United Kingdom and the Republic of France express the hope that in their relations with the Middle East countries, other states will also abide by these principles.

SM-IM-THE-20TH-CENTURY----<0172047A-----

UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

HX 632 A1 W9 no.1422
World communism in the 20th century.

0172047A MAIN

Other sources of information on the Soviet Union . . . .

SOVIET NEWS—a daily Bulletin, free on request, published by the Soviet Embassy. Contains reports, speeches, documents, and interesting news items.

SOVIET NEWS BOOKLETS—are published at the rate of one or two per month and cover nearly every aspect of Soviet life. They vary in price from 2d. to 2/-, but an annual subscription of 5/- will bring them all to you, post free.

SOVIET WEEKLY—a bright illustrated magazine published every Thursday at 3d. It contains authentic well-written articles and up-to-date photographs on Soviet industry, agriculture, sport, education, stage and screen—and intelligent comment on international affairs.

THE SOVIET UNION IN FACTS AND FIGURES—This new book of 215 pages, lavishly illustrated, and with a large folded map, is the most useful volume on the Soviet Union yet available.
Plastic cover 5/-, Library edition 7/6d.
Invaluable for home or school.

EFFORTS OF THE SOVIET UNION TOWARDS SUMMIT TALKS Jan-May, 1958 2/-

All the above (except SOVIET NEWS) will be found at many booksellers. All are available from
SOVIET NEWS, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W.7.

Published by Soviet News, 3 Rosary Gardens, London, S.W 7, and printed by March Publicity Press Ltd. (T.U. all departments), London, S.E.1.